THEORETICAL AND DISCUSSION JOURNAL OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

MARCH 1967

Marxism Today

EDITORIAL COMMENTS

IDRIS COX — AFRICA'S FUTURE—CAPITALISM OR SOCIALISM?

DAVID CRAIG — WHAT SHOULD WE TEACH?

W. H. EVANS — ART, SCIENCE AND ARCHITECTURE

DISCUSSION:

MAURICE DOBB — SOME PROBLEMS UNDER DISCUSSION

IVOR MONTAGU — NO ROOM FOR HOMO SAPIENS? A REPLY TO DISCUSSION

TERRY EAGLETON — MARXISM AND CRITICISM

Monthly 2/-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Marxism Today

Vol. II No. 3

CONTENTS

		page
	Editorial Comments	65
Idris Cox	Africa's Future—Capitalism or Socialism?	70
David Craig	What Should We Teach? A View of Further Education ...	77
W. H. Evans	Art, Science and Architecture	84
Discussion:		
Maurice Dobb	Some Problems under Discussion	88
Ivor Montagu	No Room for Homo sapiens? A Reply to Discussion ...	90
Terry Eagleton	Marxism and Criticism ...	94

AMONG ARTICLES IN APRIL AND FORTHCOMING ISSUES

John Williamson	The Negro Freedom Movement in the U.S.A.
John Hostettler	Problems of British Transport
Bert Ward	Local Government
F. C. Ball	More Light on Tressell
Colin Yardley	Radicalism, Liberalism and Marxism
David Margolis	Christopher Caudwell
Kay Beauchamp	Racialism in Britain and the Fight against it
Rev. Paul Oestreicher	Dialogue Between Christianity and Marxism
Margot Heinemann, Robin Jardine	Marxism and Criticism

Editor James Klugmann

Editorial Board

Professor J. D. Bernal
Emile Burns
Gabriel Carritt
Maurice Cornforth
Maurice Dobb
John Gollan
Jack Hendy
Arnold Kettle
John Lewis
Frank McKenna
John Mahon
Alan Morton

Editorial Correspondence
James Klugmann
16 King Street, W.C.2

Advertisements
Doris Allison,
above address

Orders and Subscriptions
usual agents or
Central Books Ltd.,
37 Gray's Inn Road,
London, W.C.1

Subscription rates
Six issues 14s. 6d.
Twelve issues 29s.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Editorial Comments

THE British Government is known throughout the capitalist world as America's largest and most subservient satellite. So Harold Wilson had to draw upon his quite inexhaustible reserves of effrontery when he warned the Consultative Committee of the Council of Europe at Strasbourg against the danger of

> "an industrial helotry under which we in Europe produce only the conventional apparatus of a modern economy, while becoming increasingly dependent on American business for the sophisticated apparatus, which will call the industrial tune in the 70s and the 80s.
>
> "We must see that the European industry of tomorrow does not become dependent on outside technology, with all that that can mean in terms of industrial power and independence. In the past two years the British Government—as a matter of policy—has saved the British computing industry and safeguarded its independence. For computer technology holds the key to the future. This approach —and not only for computers, must be applied on an international scale."

This bold claim that the British Government has been pushing steadily ahead with computer development is greatly diminished by a report in the same edition of *The Times* (January 24th) of how such computer industry as exists in West Europe (including the UK) has been conforming to an American ban on the export of computers to Eastern Europe. The report asserts that:

> "controls governing the sale of computers are almost as stringent as those covering weapons. . . . Americans are very reluctant to part with their most advanced design machines.
>
> "Because of this sensitivity, European firms that trade with Eastern block countries and America are very cautious about disclosing details of business lest they find themselves on a blacklist. At least two British companies have sold small computers to China—which is really forbidden fruit—but have kept the information a guarded secret for fear of jeopardising their trade with the United States."

What is one to think of British governments, Labour and Tory alike, that keep clamouring for more and more exports, and yet allow their exporters to be intimidated by the US Government from selling their exports to Eastern Europe and China?

Planning and Incomes

Mr. A. E. G. Robinson, Emeritus Professor of Economics in Cambridge University, has been contrasting methods of economic planning in vogue during the Labour Governments of 1945-1951 with those of the present day.

Mr. Robinson, who was a member of the planning staff in 1945, believes that it is necessary for planners to analyse and diagnose the causes of their problems. He tells us that:

> "The National Plan does almost nothing to help one to analyse these problems and see how and why they have arisen, and what is involved in solving them."

He notes that the National Plan assumes that by the 1970s no less than 280,000 more workers will be needed in manufacturing. How can the planners induce them to go there? Although 1.3 million workers were re-deployed between 1960 and 1964 only 15,000 more went into manufacturing industry. How can the Government get 280,000 extra workers to go there by 1970?

Mr. Robinson thinks that it is not only necessary to put obstacles in the way of the service industries expanding but also to increase the *incentives* to encourage workers to go into manufacturing. But it is the so-called incomes policy which is preventing these incentives from being given. Mr. Robinson observes:

> "To accept the prevention of the wages-prices spiral as the objective means that we have agreed to leave unsolved the micro-economic problem of the distribution of man power between firms and between economic activities."

Mr. Robinson does not spell out all the policy implications of this, but it is clear that the so-called incomes policy, by exerting a downward pressure on wages and salaries in manufacturing industries, is preventing men and women from going there. It is in fact preventing that sector of British industry which desperately needs man power for industrial expansion from getting it. In other words, the incomes policy, whatever the opinion of Professor Robinson, is a senseless handicap on that modernisation of industry which the Government claims to be pursuing.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"*Oft-Repeated*" *Tale*

In every phase of the economic crisis when the Government is calling for further sacrifices, it is mentioned that it is just about to cut military expenditure somewhere or other. When this particular phase of the crisis is over, the military expenditure continues as usual. This will be underlined once again by this year's arms expenditure.

The classic example is the Overseas Military Expenditure in Western Germany. At the height of the crisis last July, Mr. Callaghan declared that, if the West Germans did not agree to increase their contribution to the support of the British forces in Western Germany, a substantial number of troops would be brought home. The usual negotiations were held but the West Germans declared that they could not do anything additional to what they were already doing. Did Mr. Callaghan carry out his threat to bring a lot of the troops home? He has not carried it out nor has he abandoned it. It remains in cold storage until the next phase of the crisis, when Mr. Callaghan will no doubt once again declare his intention to get the West German Government to bear a larger portion of the costs of maintaining the Army of the Rhine and will doubtless once again declare his intention of bringing some of the troops home if they don't accede. Meantime it ought to be noted that one of the main reasons for the West German economic miracle is the truly astronomical subsidies that the economy receives from the military expenditure of the USA, Britain and France in maintaining their troops in that country.

A still greater military expenditure is being undertaken in South-East Asia. The conventional explanation is that the forces there, costing £25 million per annum in all, are there to "prevent forest fires" or to deter some states or persons unknown from "starting a conflagration". The former British colonies in the region (with the exception of Hong Kong) are supposed to be independent. Why then such enormous expenditure?

Who is expected to start the "forest fires" and the "conflagrations", and why should Britain provide the fire brigades? Who nominated the British Government for that role?

The British investments in the area are exceedingly heavy but the expense of keeping troops there to defend them is greater still.

The Labour Government will start another of its prolonged examinations and may propose to withdraw troops from some areas after 1970. Meantime the excessive military expenditure will continue to undermine the economy and the Government will continue to lecture the workers on the need to submit to further wage restraint.

Market Star-Gazing

The Confederation of British Industries is the latest of the pro-Common Market organisations that predicts that the economy will have to endure a "time of trouble" if it goes into the Market. In the long run, says the CBI, the advantages of Britain entering will be substantial but in the short run things may get worse. This is what in more vulgar quarters is called hedging your bets. The Marketeers create a tremendous furore on the advantages of joining the Market. If, as a result of joining, the condition of the British economy gets worse the Marketeers then say this is only a short term result —in the long run things will get better. How long they do not say. In short, what we are offered is speculation about the future that may or may not be correct. But here and now entry to the Market means worse conditions for the British people.

Unexpected Praise

Two days before the end of 1966 *The Times* produced a 28-page Supplement on the "Arab World". Together with a rather scrappy survey of developments in most Arab countries, there was a special "Advertisers' Announcement" on the United Arab Republic (Egypt).

As the leading Arab country it's not surprising that the UAR gets special attention, but what is most striking is that this survey (obviously designed to encourage closer economic relations between Britain and Egypt) gives an amazing account of economic and social advances in that country in recent years.

For those interested in the progress of developing countries it's worth while giving some of the figures. These can be summed up under three headings, the first of which is the Five-Year Plan (1960-65). These are the points which it makes:

1. A rate of growth at an annual average of 7.4 per cent as compared to 3 per cent set by the UN Development Decade, and higher than any rate of growth achieved by the whole group of developing countries (2-5 per cent) which represent 65 per cent of world population.
2. Both the Gross National Product and the National Income doubled between 1952 and 1965.
3. Similarly, investments were more than tripled in the same period.

The second heading is in relation to the economic advantages of the Aswan High Dam, which are summed up as follows:

1. Expansion of cultivable area by some 1-3 million acres.
2. Transfer of 700,000 acres from basin to perennial irrigation.
3. Ensuring the water requirements of all the cultivable lands.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

4. Ensuring the plantation of one million acres with rice, disregarding the rate of flood levels.
5. Generating electricity with a preliminary capacity of 3-4 billion kWh in 1968, to be raised with the completion of the project to 10 billion kWh.
6. An artificial lake before the Dam will be formed, 500 kilometres long and 10 kilometres wide, the second of its kind in the world.

Dealing with the main fields of production the survey gives an impressive account.

> "Total investments in the field of industry during the last 13 years amounted to LE. 1,000 million. Total output of industry and electricity sector rose from LE. 695 million in 1952 to LE. 1,507.8 million in 1965, industrial wages from LE. 47 million to LE. 154.3 million, industrial income from LE. 127 million to LE. 407.4 million, thus raising the share of industry and electricity in gross national income from 10 per cent in 1952 to 23.1 per cent in 1965 . . .
>
> "The share of agriculture in GNP rose from LE. 581.6 million in 1959/60 (base year) to LE. 679.1 million in 1964/65, that of industry from LE. 1,086.7 million to LE. 1,470 million, electricity from LE. 18.4 million to LE. 37.9 million, and housing and construction sector from LE. 178.1 million to LE. 265.2 million."
>
> (Note: The Egyptian pound (LE) is roughly equal to 19s. 4d.)

In the field of social welfare the survey explains that: "Before 1952, little or no legislation existed concerning labour, and scarcely any provisions were made for workmen in cases of accidents, disablement or death." It goes on to explain that:

> "Now, pensions schemes have been established for 1.6 million heads of families with about 8 million dependants. Free medical service has been instituted and both educational and vocational training facilities have been generalised. Today's worker has a say in plant management together with representation on the Board of Administration, as well as a 25 per cent share in the annual profits."

Of course, it would be too much to expect *The Times* to give the political reasons for these striking achievements, and to contrast them with the failure to achieve similar advances in countries like Nigeria, the Niger, Sudan, and several others where foreign imperialism still maintains a strong grip.

In this respect, *International Bulletin*, No. 5, on the United Arab Republic, produced by the International Department of the Communist Party, gives what is missing in *The Times* (this bi-monthly Bulletin [No. 5 is for January-February 1967] is available at Central Books or from 16 King Street, Covent Garden, London, W.C.2, at 2s. per copy, or an annual subscription of 10s.). It is something which is too good to be missed.

Credibility Gap Among the Conjurors

Further evidence has recently appeared on the continued existence of extremes of wealth in our society. The illusion that they are being eliminated by taxation is one of the confidence tricks most frequently attempted by the British ruling class, as Judith Todd showed in *The Conjurors* (Lawrence and Wishart, 7s. 6d.). Peter Townsend, Professor of Sociology at the University of Essex, in a new Fabian Tract, *Poverty, Socialism and Labour in Power* (2s. 6d.), supports her thesis in a study of the extent of poverty in present-day Britain. He contends that the extent of poverty has been underestimated and that the Labour government has done little to meet the problem of the 7 to 8 million in Britain who are living below the official subsistence minimum. Three million of them are found in the families of low-wage earners (he estimates that up to 10 per cent of wage-earning households with two or three children come in this category), $2\frac{1}{2}$ million are elderly, and government policy towards coloured immigrants creates the danger of "a group of new poor". "The Labour Government", writes Prof. Townsend, "is compromising too readily with entrenched interests, is avoiding the need to confront racial and social prejudice with moral authority, is failing to introduce institutional change."

Further evidence of the gap, and the government's incomes policy as a factor in maintaining it, comes from R. J. Nicholson, Senior Lecturer in Economic Statistics at Hull University. Writing in the January 1967 number of *Lloyds Bank Review* on "The Distribution of Personal Income", he notes that, on the basis of personal income distribution figures for 1949-1963, any trend towards greater equality ceased after 1957. The reductions in rates of direct taxation on higher incomes since 1960-1961 "underline the ending of the movement toward equality, since their effect is to improve the relative position of the top income groups". Mr. Nicholson attributes the check to greater equality mainly to the change in the comparative rates of growth of different forms of income: since 1957, the rate of growth of incomes has slowed down in comparison with the striking acceleration of the growth rate in rent, dividends and interest, "emerging as the most rapidly growing sector of incomes since 1957". He concludes that "the present deflationary policies, the incomes freeze and the slowing down of the growth of the national product, following the stability of the income distribution since 1957, must make it doubtful whether the trend in the distribution of incomes for the immediate future is set in the direction of greater equality".

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Student Christians Look at Marx and Freud

Another example of the increasing engagement of members of the Christian Churches in the modern world was the annual Conference of the Student Christian Movement at Swanick, Derbyshire, at the end of December. The subject, "Man Unmasked—Marx, Freud and Jesus" drew a larger attendance than for several years—some 350 students from all kinds of higher education establishments, including research students, and some members of the clergy.

Lectures to the whole Conference were given—on Marx by Jack Dunman of the Communist Party, on Freud by Zev. Barbu, Professor of Sociology at the University of Sussex, and on Jesus by the Rev. Ian Mackenzie, Adviser on Religious Programmes to ABC TV. Six Commissions studied various aspects of the subject, including an "Introduction to Marx", for three or four hours each day. There were late night brains trusts from 10 p.m. till midnight on two days, and various informal groups.

That the discussions were intensely practical became clear on the fourth day, Sunday, when two sessions planned as summaries, were converted into a Full Conference discussion on matters felt to be of burning concern. One of these was Christian disunity, which prevented the Conference from taking communion collectively, because of the rules of the various Churches; and the other was Vietnam. After a two-hour extension of time, a resolution was passed by a very large majority, which welcomed the proposals of U Thant; supported the mission to Hanoi of Bishop Ambrose Reeves and other clergymen; called on the British Government to withdraw its support for American policy; and gave a pledge of action, including even the possibility of a student delegation to Vietnam. An amendment to delete the clause dealing with the British Government was defeated by a large majority. So keen was the feeling on this resolution that the final act of worship, which included readings from Marx and Freud, "the two prophets", scheduled for 8 p.m. did not begin until 11.15 p.m.

The Dialogue Continues

A large part of the Conference was thus an extension of the Christian-Marxist dialogue, other manifestations of which have been mentioned in these columns. The special importance of this one was the evident desire of the younger generation to be included in it. There was universal recognition of the essential contribution that Marxism has made and is making to the modern world; and hardly a trace of conventional prejudices.

On the other hand, the very richness of the thought of Marx and Engels on historical, philosophical, and cultural questions seemed to create a danger that the kernel might be missed. There was a certain reluctance, even among the most interested, to recognise that the essential feature of capitalism is *exploitation*.

If this is not accepted, the conclusion that the replacement of capitalism by socialism as the world's priority task today is at best weak and lacking in determination. Marxists must be able to convince on this fundamental thesis, while finally relating it to all the economic phenomena of the present day.

Since dialogues involve the obligation to listen to the partner in discussion, it should be noted that a feeling was expressed that Marxists were sometimes inclined to neglect the individual in the interests of the community. Another criticism made was that Marxists, because of their preoccupation with immediate tasks, seem sometimes to put a ceiling on future development, while some other philosophies try to look further ahead.

However unjustified some of us may feel such criticisms to be, it is important to see how others see us, especially others who approach Marxism in so friendly a way as most of the participants at the Conference, and to see what we can learn from the points they raise.

Political Justice

Heinrich Hannover, one of the younger of the group of good lawyers in West Germany who have won reputations in West Germany by their courageous defences of political cases (such cases are numbered in thousands in that neo-Nazi country) has written with his wife, a historian, an admirable book *Politische Justice 1918/1933* (a paperback of Fischer Bucherei, Frankfurt-on-Main).

In exposing the shameless subservience of the judical apparatus of the Weimar Government to the forces of reaction, the writers give a very vivid and useful picture of the combined weakness and rascality of the Weimar Republic, and recall many events of the period which are insufficiently known to most of us, but contain many lessons that help us in estimating present-day developments in West Germany. Among their subjects are the Bavarian Soviet Republic, the Kapp putsch, the murders of Erzberger, Rathenau and Max Harden, the trial of Hitler, the Feme Murders, the Black Reichswehr, Karl Ossietsky, the Cheka Trial, the von Papen *coup*, and the Kurfürstendamm Pogrom. As one reads the book, one can understand how reformist governments always fail to establish Socialist states or even to resist reactionary developments. It is a guide-book on how not to make or maintain a revolution.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

American Reprints

With prices of rare and out-of-print Marxist works rising to fantastic heights, the move towards the publication of reprints at more accessible prices is extremely welcome.

In this connection there is some good news from the United States. *International Publishers* are planning to republish this year M. N. Pokrovsky's "History of Russia", Franz Mehring's "Social Forces in German History", and G. Plekhanov's "Fundamental Problems of Marxism".

The *Monthly Review Press* has also entered the reprint publishing business, and published at the end of last year Antonio Labriola's "Essays on the Materialistic Conception of History" and "Dollar Diplomacy" by Joseph Freeman and Scott Nearing.

This latter book, first published in 1927, was a pioneering study of the methods, forms and aims of American imperialist expansion with special emphasis on the relations between the United States and the countries of Latin America.

May we specially recommend, amongst the American reprints, the recent *New World Paperback* edition of "The Autobiography of Big Bill Haywood". Big Bill was a Socialist and a founder and leader of the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW) and became the storm centre of many of the great labour struggles on the eve of the First World War.

Coins against Corruption

In the course of its long history, the British radical and socialist movement has found an almost infinite variety of forms of struggle and forms of expression.

From the 1760s ("Wilkes and Liberty") onwards you find not only books, folders, leaflets, posters, prints, cartoons, songsheets, slogans for chalking, but inscribed snuff boxes, radical jugs, and seditious tankards for imbibing the sustenance of life at the radical taverns.

One favourite form of radical propaganda was the use of commemorative medallions (the Peterloo medal for instance) and, during the 1790s, when official copper coins were in short supply, the making of token coinage—particularly farthings and halfpennies—bearing radical designs and radical legends.

We have written of this before in the editorial comments, but I should like to recommend two short articles by Christopher Brunel in the May and September issues last year of the monthly collector's journal *Coins and Medals*.[1]

[1] *Coins and Medals*, Link House, Dingwall Avenue, Croydon, Surrey. In the May issue "Tokens of Political Upheaval", and in the September issue "Citizen Stanhope".

In the article on "Tokens of Political Upheaval" he writes of the radical tokens of the 1790s, particularly of those manufactured by Thomas Spence, the militant radical and agrarian socialist, who distributed his revolutionary songs, leaflets, journals and tokens from his bookshop—"The Hive of Liberty" in Little Turnstile, Holborn.

Burke, in his reactionary hatred of the working people, used to refer to them as "the swinish multitude". Radicals of the time, like Spence, took up the challenge and accepted the pig as the emblem of radicalism. (I have a leaflet, incidentally, printed in the 1790s in Upper King Street, of a militant pig guillotining Pitt, the Prime Minister, to the tune of "God Shave the King"). He edited a fighting radical paper under the title of *Pig's Meat* (1793-1796).

One halfpenny token, advertising this penny weekly, has another fine militant pig trampling on a crown and on other emblems of the establishment, surmounted by a Cap of Liberty.

A similar radical reference to Burke's would-be insult is seen, Brunel writes, in Daniel Eaton's Middlesex halfpenny token. Eaton, radical bookseller and publisher, distributed Paine's *Rights of Man* as well as his own militant journal *Hog's Meat, or Politics for the People*, and the sign of his house, then at 74 Newgate Street, was "The Cock and Swine".

On one side of this token, pigs are feeding in a trough with a cock on a fence behind them (the cock heralded the new dawn of enlightenment) with the legend "Printer to the Majesty of the People, London, 1795". On the obverse side is a bust of Eaton with the Latin motto—*franges non flectes* (you may break but will not bend).

Brunel, in a second article, describes tokens and medals illustrative of "Citizen Stanhope", old Etonian, Earl, radical, "sans-culottes", who preferred the title of "citizen" to that of "Lord".

On June 6th, 1795, Stanhope introduced a motion into the Lords against interfering in the affairs of France, but found himself the lone supporter of his own resolution.

A medal was struck in his honour bearing on one side the motto "The Minority of One, 1795", and on the other "Stanhope the Friend of Trial by Jury, Liberty of the Press, Parliamentary Reform, Annual Parliaments, Habeas Corpus Act, Abolition of Sinecures, and of a Speedy Peace with the French Republic".

Some revolutionary coinage would not be unwelcome today, and we leave our readers to suggest suitable designs and legends.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Africa's Future—Capitalism or Socialism?

Idris Cox

(This is the text of the lecture given by Idris Cox at the African Seminar organised by Marxism Today, *on October 1st, 1966. Texts of other lectures will appear in future issues.)*

EARLIER speakers in this Seminar have given an outline of the forces of the African Revolution. The discussion revealed different political assessments of class structures in Africa, and to what extent there has been a growth of class society. This vast continent is so varied that what is true of one part of Africa is unlikely to apply to other parts. It is always dangerous to look at Africa as one indivisible whole, for the extent to which class society has developed, and the nature of class relations, differs from one African country to another.

From one standpoint it could be possible today to speak of two Africas—the independent states north of Rhodesia, and the remaining British, French, Spanish and Portuguese colonies. But even this leaves out of account new changes and sharp political contrasts. Basutoland (now Lesotho) and Bechuanaland (Botswana) only recently became independent. This is the constitutional and formal aspect, but in reality they are still under outside domination, and prisoners of the apartheid rulers of South Africa.

South Africa and Rhodesia are both "independent", the former having won independence by constitutional means, and the latter by illegal means. But what is common to both is that the Africans (who are the vast majority) are still under a special kind of colonial rule, enforced by all kinds of repressive measures. In many respects their conditions are worse than those formerly experienced under direct imperialist rule in those African countries which have since won political independence—for white minority rule is an expression of the alliance of foreign imperialism with the racialist rulers in southern Africa.

My only purpose in making these preliminary remarks is to underline the need to avoid lumping all African countries together, as if they were faced with exactly similar problems. True, in one respect, all the 38 independent African states (leaving out South Africa and Rhodesia) have to face the challenge: "What next after Independence?". Depending on the relation of class forces in each of them, and the political outlook of the African leadership in these states, the challenge will be answered in different ways.

Independence and After

The struggle to win independence was a political expression of the common desire of all classes—workers, peasantry, intellectuals, and rising African capitalists. This gave rise to an alliance in practice of different class forces—even though not always expressed in an organised form. It was the united expression of all those whose interests (in different degrees) were being undermined by imperialism.

After winning independence, it seems clear that there develops a change in these class relations. Among influential sections of the African capitalists there is the conception that the main aim of African liberation has been achieved, but for the majority of the workers, peasantry and a great number of intellectuals, it is only the first stage and from which the next stage is to win complete national liberation. This also involves the transformation of the old colonial economy, a sharper struggle against neo-colonialism and intensified imperialist exploitation, and the all-round raising of living standards.

To achieve this involves an even stronger and sharper fight against imperialism, but in conditions in which there are more severe tests for the alliance of class forces. Having won the leading positions in government, many African leaders become satisfied with the "status quo". African capitalist elements resist any further change and tend towards closer co-operation with imperialism.

On the other hand, the masses who have fought for independence are anxious to advance to the next stage of making basic economic changes, raising living standards and exercising a greater political role in carrying through these changes. It is at this point that rival political views are expressed more sharply, and differences become more profound on the precise path of future development.

Marxist Parties

Before independence Marxist literature was forbidden in all the former British colonies in Africa. Because of the different kind of French colonial

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

apparatus (with African leaders elected to the French National Assembly), it was more difficult to impose this ban in the former French colonies. Moreover, the close connections between the French Communist Party and the African liberation movements (especially between the trade unions) gave an impetus to the growth of Marxist ideas.

The Communist Parties in Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia, Egypt and Sudan, were deeply involved in the liberation struggle. The Communist Party was always banned in Egypt, and after independence in the other four countries, as also was the African Independence Party (PAI) of Senegal, which proclaims Marxist principles. The Communist Party of South Africa was formed in 1921 and declared illegal after 1948. The most recently formed African parties based on Marxist principles are the Socialist Workers and Farmers' Party (SWAFP) of Nigeria, and the Communist Party of Basutoland (now Lesotho).

Despite all bans, Marxist ideas were spreading in Africa during and after the second world war. The mighty blows of the Soviet armed forces against fascism made a strong political impact on a world scale. Thousands of Africans also fought against fascism, and their experiences had a marked effect on their political ideas when they returned to Africa. It is not surprising that the African ex-servicemen in Nigeria, Ghana, Kenya and elsewhere were among the foremost in later years in the struggle for independence.

All these factors, taken together, serve to emphasise that socialist ideas in Africa did not simply fall out of the sky. Nor were they entirely a product of African historical development, though this also made a strong impact. They were an expression of the great stimulus given to socialism and socialist ideas arising from the defeat of fascism and the growth of the socialist world.

The winning of political independence opened out a new stage in Africa and presented a new challenge, either to succumb to the external (and internal) pressure to expand the economy on capitalist principles, or to advance on the path towards socialism. Is it possible to by-pass (or to restrict and shorten) capitalist development in the new African states and advance instead at a more rapid pace to socialism? These are not academic questions for Africa today, for upon the answers will depend whether the new African states can eliminate what remains of imperialist domination and advance to socialism, or whether imperialism will even strengthen its grip and rob the new states of all the hardly-won fruits of independence.

This brings me to my two main themes :

(i) the existing socialist concepts in Africa; and

(ii) how far are Marxist ideas applicable to African conditions.

Socialist Concepts

It is not strange that these bear the imprint of the stage of historical development reached in Africa, but are also influenced on the one hand by the character of the struggle against imperialism, and by two opposite pressures—the advance in the socialist world and the political domination of imperialism and its ideology in Africa. Though it is clear that foreign monopoly firms are rapidly expanding their operations in Africa (together with a considerable indigenous growth of capitalism) it is significant that most African leaders dare not openly advocate the path of capitalist development.

This is a tribute to the mass opposition to imperialism, and the deep suspicion among ordinary Africans of the capitalist system, in contrast to the strong political impact of the socialist world. But in my view it does not follow that the conception in Africa of what socialism means is on a higher level than elsewhere in the world. Among Africans who oppose capitalist development are many who seek salvation in the return to what they conceive to be the classless system of the past, despite its primitive conditions.

At the same time, African conditions, and the vastly different relation of class forces, make a strong impact on socialist concepts in Africa. In my recent book *Socialist Ideas in Africa*,[1] I have tried to make a modest contribution to the growing dialogue between Marxists and non-Marxists (within and outside Africa) on the political character of these concepts and their relevance to the situation in Africa today.

In tropical Africa communal land ownership and tribal society are fairly common, with a virtual absence either of feudalism or a developed capitalist society. The main concept of socialism in Africa at present is one of a special type of "African Socialism", different from that of the socialist world, and also from the kind of socialist systems likely to arise in Europe. The main argument against Marxism is that it applies only to capitalist countries and is not applicable to Africa, where it is claimed capitalism has not developed and where the class struggle does not exist.

It seems to me that one of the main reasons for this standpoint is the confusion between the basic economic and political *content* of socialism (which must inevitably be universal in character) and the particular *form* of socialism in different countries and the methods applied to achieve this aim.

[1] Lawrence and Wishart, 1966.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Basic Principles

Socialism will most likely take on different forms in Africa (and even from one African country to another), and Africans will chart their own path to achieve it. To advocate socialism (African or otherwise) means nothing unless the concept provides for definite and universal basic principles. Among these principles, in my view, *four* main features need to be underlined. I would define them as follows:

(a) Common ownership of the land and all means of production.
(b) Production for use, and not for profit.
(c) Large-scale modern industry and agriculture, based on planned production.
(d) Political power in the hands of the people, based on democracy in all spheres of life, with the workers and peasantry as the decisive force.

These basic principles apply to Africa as to any other part of the world. They cannot be confined geographically to particular countries, or even to continents—any more than it is possible to conceive of a science of African chemistry, Nigerian physics, or Kenyan mathematics.

Like all other sciences, socialism is a science which applies to the whole world. What passes for "African Socialism" or "Arab Socialism" is in reality a diversion from the path towards scientific socialism. This does not mean that all its advocates are consciously adopting this disguise to conceal the real path to socialism. Most Africans look upon it as something unique for their continent, and an expression of their own identity in opposition to imperialism and capitalism.

However, among its leading advocates are political leaders who have not the slightest intention of building socialism in their countries. They use the formula to maintain and strengthen their influence among the African peoples who are seeking a new way of life. For many of these political leaders it is simply a cover for a policy in practice which means co-operation with imperialism and their belief in capitalist principles.

"African Socialism"

There is time only to deal with two or three specific examples. Until 1962, and under the influence of the late George Padmore, Dr. Nkrumah was most eloquent in advocating "African Socialism". But when President Senghor of Senegal organised an international seminar at Dakar in December 1962, to peddle his pet theme of "Negritude" and to expound this concept of "African Socialism", this was a warning signal to Dr. Nkrumah.

It is well known that President Senghor is wedded to co-operation with French imperialism, is always full of praise for de Gaulle, and strongly resists any basic changes in Senegal. So this seminar was the signal for Dr. Nkrumah to abandon the formula of "African Socialism", and to start without delay to wield an ideological campaign against it, and to advocate scientific socialism.

This was the main theme of the Ghanaian weekly paper *Spark*, which was launched soon after, in which scientific socialism was interpreted as the application of Marxist ideas to African conditions. It is not surprising that *Spark* was the first paper to be suppressed after the military coup which took place in February 1966.

The second example of African Socialism is that of President Kenyatta and Tom Mboya in Kenya. Nearly two years ago the Kenya Government came out with an official programme for "African Socialism". It will be remembered that Oginga Odinga, who was then Vice-President of Kenya, at that time expressed the view that this was a popular concept and would do no harm, since it could be interpreted in different ways. As we know, Odinga has since broken away from KANU and is leading the opposition Kenya People's Union against this policy, and for the principles of scientific socialism. This is not surprising, for the Mboya concept of "African Socialism" is expressed in practice in huge compensation payments for land bought from white settlers, in exorbitant sums being paid by Africans buying over European land, and in close co-operation with foreign imperialism. As for its internal policy, it advocates workers becoming directors, managers and shareholders of foreign monopoly firms, but for the African majority the result is low living standards and mass unemployment, together with the ruthless suppression of political opponents.

No wonder that even the extremely moderate British weekly Fabian journal *Venture* (September 1965) expressed the view that this policy could never lead to socialism, African or otherwise, and that the "Kenya Government had opted for the capitalist direction of economic development".

Former advocates of "Arab Socialism" have also recently changed their views. This concept has now been abandoned in Egypt, and President Nasser and other Egyptian political leaders are laying stress on the concept of scientific socialism, and insist that workers and peasants must occupy the leading positions in the country. Moreover, though the separate existence of a Communist Party is still illegal, all Communists have now been released from prison and detention camps and are involved in responsible political work.

Class Relations

Now to the second theme: "How far are Marxist ideas applicable to African conditions?" Many African leaders argue that the writings of Marx and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Engels do not apply to Africa because their experience was confined to European countries which had a developed capitalist economy, and in which the class struggle was being waged between the industrial proletariat and the capitalist class.

They maintain that the class struggle does not exist in Africa, where class formation is in its infancy or does not even exist. They maintain that everyone has common interests, and that the one-party system is the only suitable form of political organisation.

While accepting the view that class formations in Africa are still at an early stage, I strongly contest the view that classes do not exist in Africa today. One chapter in my book gives a factual survey of capitalist growth in many African countries, alongside class differentiation in agriculture, a moderate expansion of industry, and the growth of a working class. During the past year these trends have increased more rapidly.

True, the main economic enterprises are still in the hands of the big foreign monopoly firms. But not only is there a rising capitalist element being integrated with these firms as directors and managers, but also a considerable growth of an African capitalist class in trade and commerce, transport and contracting, and a big increase in the number of small African capitalist firms.

Generally speaking however, most tropical African countries (with the exception of southern Africa) are in the pre-capitalist stage of development. For them it is not a matter of the transition from capitalism to socialism (as in Britain and the rest of Europe), but whether they have to go through the full process of capitalist development (which took nearly three centuries in Britain) before achieving socialism. We have to consider whether there is a prospect in Africa of a non-capitalist development towards socialism, or at least, of restricting the period and scope of capitalist development in the advance towards socialism.

It is true that the building of socialism is easier when a developed capitalist economy is taken over. It was Lenin who emphasised that it would be difficult in Britain to capture power from the capitalist class, but once this was achieved it would be comparatively easier to build socialism. On the other hand, it was comparatively easier for the workers and peasants to win power in Tsarist Russia, but extremely difficult to build socialism.

Writing the *Communist Manifesto* 120 years ago, it is obvious that Marx and Engels had in mind mainly the class struggle in Europe. This historic document ended with the call "Workers of all Lands, Unite". Lenin in his time realised that in most countries outside Europe it was the peasantry which constituted the vast majority. With the growth of imperialism and national liberation struggles it was now possible to develop the national revolution into a socialist revolution, and the new call was "Oppressed Peoples of all Lands, Unite". So no-one can argue that Lenin thought only in terms of workers against capitalists. No revolutionary leader ever laid stronger emphasis on the alliance of the working class and peasantry, or worked out so clearly the stages of transition from the democratic to the socialist revolution.

But to come back to Marx and Engels. They lived in a capitalist society, and from their analysis of this society charted the way forward to socialism. Over a century ago little was known in Europe of the various stages of historical development in Africa, but Marx and Engels were both fully conscious of pre-capitalist stages of development in Asia, Europe and elsewhere, and had in fact made a serious study of pre-capitalist societies.

Pre-Capitalist Society

One has only to read Engels' famous classic *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, to be convinced of the foregoing, or to study Marx's work *Pre-Capitalist Formations*. Many African leaders seem to suffer from the illusion that because many parts of Africa are in the pre-capitalist stage today that this did not exist anywhere else in the world. But the fact remains that the basic aspects of African tribal society have existed earlier in most parts of the world.

Late in the 19th century village communities based on communal land ownership still existed in Tsarist Russia. Many Russian political leaders idealised this communal system, and did not realise that it was rapidly breaking down with the growth of a rich peasantry within the framework of feudalism. On the other hand, Marx and Engels conceived the possibility of preserving this communal form of society and raising it to a higher level, but *only as a result of socialist revolution in Europe*.

As we know, this did not happen, and it was not until over 20 years later in the 1917 revolution before Russia was able to restore communal ownership, but on a much higher level. Today we have a situation in which socialism has triumphed over one-third of the world, and another one-third consists of new states which have achieved political independence. So the prospect of by-passing capitalism, or at least of restricting the period and scope of its development, is far more favourable than it was in the late 19th century.

This does not mean that African countries can jump directly from their present stage of development into a socialist society. I agree with Ken Post that Africans are not in a position to choose between

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

capitalism and socialism (just as items in a shopping list), for Africa is still largely within the capitalist sector, but they can choose between a further advance on the capitalist road or effort to chart out a path to socialism. It is more likely that there will be several stages of transition towards socialism, and this is not only a matter of economic growth, but of big changes in the relation of class forces in Africa.

The African masses were the main force in the struggle for independence (which I would qualify as constitutional independence and not as political independence in the full sense of the word), but they were led by African bourgeois elements, together with the petty bourgeoisie and the intelligentsia. Today these forces occupy most of the key positions in the new states, but because of their class position are now hesitant in leading the way forward to the next stage of economic independence and complete liberation.

To advance the transition towards socialism it seems clear that the growing African working class and the peasantry must advance to leading positions in the new African states. And the struggle to achieve this must be directed not only against imperialism and neo-colonialism (as in the fight for independence), but also against the bourgeois elements in key positions in the new states who tend to become allies of imperialism. Whether this means armed struggle the Africans themselves will decide. In my view, armed struggle is inevitable in many parts of Africa—though victory in one part may pave the way in another.

Marxist Ideas

This also means an ideological battle against the illusion of some special kind of "African Socialism", and to raise instead the political level to an understanding of the principles of scientific socialism. To achieve this it does not seem to me to be an essential condition that Marxist parties must exist in Africa on exactly the same model as in the rest of the world—at least, not in the early stages. I have no illusion that European Marxists possess some kind of magic solution for African problems. In Africa, the number of Marxists is growing rapidly, and Marxist ideas are spreading. The advance to socialism in Africa will come from African revolutionaries, and not from Europe; just as the advance to socialism in Britain will come from British Marxists and revolutions, and not from the Soviet Union or China.

However, Marxism is a world theory, and the living experience of the struggle to achieve and to build socialism in any part of the world can enrich the revolutionary movement elsewhere in the world. Not only can Marxism assist in the advance of the African Revolution—African experience can also enrich Marxism on a world scale.

The transition to socialism in Africa does not depend only on internal changes within Africa itself. This is certainly vital, especially the advance of African unity in the struggle against imperialism and neo-colonialism. But it equally depends on close economic and political co-operation with the existing socialist world, both in respect of assisting their economic development and in maintaining world peace and resisting the imperialist cold war. It depends equally upon solidarity action in Britain and other capitalist countries with every aspect of the struggle in Africa.

Africa has made history in recent years and makes an increasing impact on world affairs. The African people will choose their own path, and decide their *own* future, but we are also concerned because we live in the same world. As distinct from Britain and other capitalist countries they have the choice of embarking on the road to capitalism or choosing the road to socialism. By choosing the road to socialism, it will assist the struggle for socialism throughout the world.

(In the time available for questions and discussion a wide range of important issues were raised, chief of which were: (i) socialist economic aid; (ii) whether there was a choice of capitalism or socialism in Africa; (iii) the danger of Marxist ideas in Africa being presented as a copy of European Marxism; and (iv) whether it was correct to accept the banning and dissolution of Communist Parties in Africa.

Idris Cox replied to the questions and discussion along the following lines.)

Socialist Aid

Socialist economic aid to the independent African states is extremely important, not simply in relation to the volume and value of socialist aid available, but its different character from the numerous imperialist "aid schemes". First, it is provided on more generous terms—about 2 per cent as against 5 per cent to 6 per cent for British and United States loans—and for a longer term. Second, socialist aid is advanced only for the state and co-operative sector of production, and not to the private sector which is concerned only with production for profit. Thirdly, it is directed more especially to creating industrial enterprises in the public sector.

The question has been asked as to whether it is not possible to expand socialist economic aid on a scale that would enable the African states to transform their backward economies and rule out entirely the resort to investments from imperialist countries or economic "aid schemes". It seems to me there are two aspects to this problem. First, it is obvious that the economic resources of the socialist world (despite its rapid economic growth) are not sufficient to solve the economic problems of the African continent. Secondly, even if this were

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

possible, if African economic development towards socialism becomes so dependent on outside aid, it would rule out the enormous value gained from the African political experience of struggle to build up their own economic system.

On the first point, on many occasions I have been struck with the facile belief that the socialist countries have unlimited economic resources to place at the disposal of the newly independent states. In practice, this is applied to the Soviet Union, for even China has limited resources for this purpose. Moreover, there is the tendency to forget that in the first decade after the Second World War the Soviet Union extended vast economic aid to China and the socialist countries of Eastern Europe, and in the past decade more particularly to Cuba. None of us are in a position to assess fully the enormous sacrifices which the Soviet people have made, not only to build their own socialist system and its defence during the Second World War, but also to assist the rest of the socialist world.

What is amazing after all these sacrifices, is that they are still willing to make even bigger sacrifices to assist non-socialist countries to transform their economies and so raise their living standards. This in itself reveals a high level of political consciousness and sense of international solidarity. If increased economic aid were possible (and some African states are not even willing to accept it) I am sure there would be no hesitation in increasing it.

However, in my view, socialist economic aid cannot possibly become a substitute for the necessary creative economic development in Africa itself, but is mainly a useful supplement to the economic growth which must develop out of African conditions and its present stage of development.

Is there a Choice?

As to whether the African states have a choice of capitalism or socialism, it depends almost entirely on the kind of political leadership which exists. I agree with Ken Post that Africa as a whole is still within the world capitalist sector, but this is only true at different levels in different parts of Africa. In South Africa, Rhodesia, Congo, and to some extent in the Ivory Coast, there is a fairly high level of capitalist development. But in Egypt capitalist development has been retarded, and replaced by striking socialist measures, while in Guinea and Mali there has been extremely little capitalist development.

It is not really a matter of preventing any degree of capitalist development, but rather of deliberately restricting its scope and consciously taking steps to ensure that the growth of the state and co-operative sector of production is far more rapid than the private sector, and ultimately to reduce the private sector to a bare minimum.

From this standpoint the remarks of Michael Harmel were extremely important in relation to the political struggle between the Russian Bolsheviks and Mensheviks. As is well known, the Menshevik standpoint was that the growth of capitalism was a pre-condition of the struggle for socialism. On the other hand, the Bolsheviks insisted that the Russian capitalists were no longer a progressive force and could not lead the democratic revolution, and that only an alliance of the workers and peasantry could end the Tsarist regime and lead the way to socialism without the pre-condition of capitalist development.

In other words, in the changed world conditions under imperialism, and the relation of class forces in Tsarist Russia, the alliance of the workers and peasantry would lead the national democratic revolution and transform it into the socialist revolution. That was nearly 50 years ago, and the great advance of socialism in the Soviet Union is the living proof that Lenin and the Bolsheviks were correct.

"European" Marxism

On the third point, whether Marxist ideas in Africa have to be a copy of European Marxism, I have already stressed that the science of Marxism is universal, but that its application will depend on the specific conditions existing in different parts of the world, and on the balance of class forces. Certainly in Europe it is not a matter of by-passing capitalism, since this system has been developed in different parts of Europe for nearly three centuries.

In Europe, it is a struggle to end capitalism and imperialism, to win political power from the hands of the big monopoly firms, and to build socialism. In short, it is the transition from capitalism to socialism. But in Africa it is a matter of cutting short or eliminating the long and painful process of capitalist development (which can only become a bigger obstacle to achieving socialism), and by-passing the full capitalist stage.

There is nothing static about Marxism. It is being enriched with new experiences every day. Its basic principles in Africa will be similar to those in Europe and the rest of the world, but the experience of its application in Africa will be of great value to Marxists everywhere. Far from being a mere extension of "European" Marxism, it will serve to deepen and enrich the knowledge and experience of the whole world Communist movement.

The Communist Parties in Africa are embedded in the national liberation struggle, and converts to Marxism are growing rapidly. They have no need to rely on Marxists outside Africa to solve their problems—though they appreciate the value of close contact and the interchange of Marxist ideas. They represent a new creative political force which will not only find solutions to the problems of the African

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Revolution, but will also serve to enrich Marxism on a world scale.

Ban on Communist Parties

It has been argued that it was wrong for Communists in Algeria and Egypt to accept the enforced dissolution of their Parties. This is a difficult and complicated problem, and it is not easy for British Marxists to pronounce judgment. All the more so, because this is something outside our own experience.

At the same time, we need to be clear that Marxists everywhere (including Algeria and Egypt) have always argued the need for a united revolutionary Party in every country, based on Marxist principles. Of the 81 Communist and Workers' Parties in 1960, no less than 20 were illegal. They have waged a heroic struggle in the most difficult conditions and will continue to do so, as did the illegal Communist Parties in Algeria and Egypt.

When the National Liberation Front (FLN) in Algeria and the Arab Socialist Union (ASU) in Egypt presented the Communist Parties with the alternative of remaining illegal, or becoming individual members with full political rights of either the FLN or ASU they were faced with an extremely difficult choice. Both the FLN and the ASU have set the aim of achieving socialism. They each insist upon the principle of a one-party system. Communists are by no means tied to this principle, but advocate instead a united national democratic front embracing all revolutionary forces agreed on a common programme. Unfortunately, this was not acceptable by the ruling parties in Algeria and Egypt.

What were the Communists to do in this situation? They had the choice of carrying on the illegal struggle as an independent revolutionary Party, or becoming individual members within the existing one-party system. If this party had been reactionary and pro-imperialist, the answer would have been quite clear. The Communists would refuse to join and would insist upon their independent Party and their illegal struggle. However, both the FLN and ASU also have the aim of socialism, and Communists are allowed as individuals to express their Marxist standpoint within these parties, and even to occupy key positions—as many of them do at the present time. What they had to consider was whether they could best advance the aims of the socialist revolution by working within a recognised one-party system which set socialism as its aim, or by being still isolated in prisons and detention camps.

For over 40 years since its foundation in 1924, the Communist Party was illegal, with many hundreds of its members in prison year after year. As a result of the political changes initiated by President Nasser and the ASU after the 1962 National Charter, and the new aim of achieving scientific socialism, all Communist prisoners were released in 1964.

Faced with this changed situation and the choice between political isolation or becoming active within the ASU, an enlarged meeting of the Central Committee of the Egyptian Communist Party in April 1965, decided on the second alternative. At the same time, while accepting its responsibility to join with all revolutionary forces aiming to build socialism in Egypt, it made clear that it did not accept entirely the ideological standpoint of the ASU. In its Manifesto, following this enlarged meeting, the Central Committee pointed out that:

> "Divergencies regarding the methods to adopt in order to solve political, economic and social problems may exist and will exist. But despite these factors, one truth emerges: what unites the socialists is by far greater and more important than what divides them."

The Egyptian Communists were convinced that big advances were being made towards achieving socialism in Egypt, and that this proved that there was more than one road to socialism. But its achievement did not depend entirely on the ASU in its present form, nor in the separate existence of the Communist Party. The main condition was the unity of all revolutionary forces into a vanguard party combining both of them:

> "This is why the Egyptian Communist Party considers that the Egyptian road to socialism demands the gathering together and unification of all the revolutionary forces wanting to achieve socialism, into a single vanguard revolutionary party. This party will not be the Communist Party, and . . . the question of a revolutionary vanguard party which does not conform to the classical framework of the Communist Party is posed in a number of countries".

One may agree or disagree with this perspective, but what is clearly obvious is that the Egyptian Communists have not tied themselves to rigid formulas (much less to the methods of "European" Marxists) and are striving to apply Marxism in a creative way in light of the actual situation in Egypt and the relation of class forces.

It may well be that the advance towards socialism in many African countries will not involve the formation of Communist Parties on the European model, for the relation of class forces is very different from Europe. Africa's revolutionary vanguard (both Marxist and non-Marxist together) will map out their own path to socialism. Marxists in Britain cannot choose this path for them. Their responsibility is to organise all forms of solidarity to assist them to advance along the path they have chosen.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What Should We Teach?

A View of Further Education

David Craig

IN the last few years a great deal of discussion of education has been about how it is organised—comprehensive schools, the new domination of trade union classes by the TUC, turning the Colleges of Advanced Technology into universities, the lack of applicants for science places in the universities, etc. These are all crucial, but it is also necessary to see what needs to be bettered at the point where education takes effect, i.e. in the classroom. We must not dwell on arrangements at the *expense* of the nourishment of minds and personalities which the whole thing is for. True, personal mental growth is not easy to legislate for and will always be, at least partly, a matter of what people make of opportunities for themselves. But the way minds grow is not immune to conditioning, even if we rightly no longer relish Gorky's phrase "engineers of the soul"; so, if we want to see to it that the conditioning is wise and effective, we surely have to consider the content of education as much as its administrative system.

One can gather from the journals and from reports from schools, universities, etc., that much pioneering work is now being done on more effective, more psychologically realistic methods of teaching. Yet resistance still lingers, and more than lingers. In my university (a new one) we have set up Boards of Studies instead of faculties, in the hope that boundaries between departments can thus be broken down enough to allow close meshing-in between subjects relevant to each other. Yet although these boards spend hours and hours discussing *arrangements*—co-examiners' fees, the minutiae of graduate regulations, even their own composition—it has been the devil's own job to get them to give half an hour to scrutinising an actual syllabus, a book-list, the sequence of topics in a course—that is, *education itself*. The stock resistance is, "You're trying to teach us our own job". Much need!

My criticisms of further or higher education as it is today, and proposals for betterment, fall under five heads:

(i) Education for life.
(ii) Specialisation.
(iii) More doesn't mean worse.
(iv) Arts and Sciences.
(v) Crossing the inter-subject boundaries.

Naturally these merge into each other, and what follows is not a systematic coverage of the whole—that would require a research programme, or rather several. This article offers some suggestions from my own viewpoint in the English Department of a new university. So long as some readers can say, "Yes, I know what he means, that happens here too", then a real problem will have been opened up. If not, it may be that I have been too much hedged in by recent experience of my own.

Education for Life

(i) Both Arts and Sciences fall short of being present-day enough; they do not concern themselves enough to impart material and ways of thinking specifically and directly useful in our present situation. In the Arts there is a constant struggle to bring in new material on a par with older. Since candidates whom we interview on the eve of their A-level GCE exams often give as a reason for their wanting to come to us the fact that our syllabus goes up to the literature written *in the previous year*, this suggests there is a need for up-to-date material which is not generally being satisfied. Surely by now we should be able to take it for granted that new literature is *as likely* to be significant and mind-forming as older work, and further, that starting in the present and going backwards is at least as likely to foster people's ability to make sense of historical developments as the old way of starting at the year dot and coming up to as near, say, the Great War as you can before time runs out.

In the schools, too, it seems, literature of the fifties and sixties is usually an extra, a sixth-form treat once the real business of life (passing exams) is over for the time being. True, children lucky enough to stay at school past 15 will usually have read *The Lord of the Flies*. But how many of them know the post-war period, as a period, with one-tenth the thoroughness with which they know "the Romantics" or the Elizabethans or the standard dose of Milton? On paper, modern periods may have as much chance of being studied for A-level as any other, since they are on the list of options for most examining boards. In practice, at least in Lancashire (according to a recent meeting with headmasters and headmistresses), the Romantics, or the Victorian novel, are much more favoured. This means, in effect, a lag of two generations, for it was fifty years ago that there occurred simultaneously the entry of "modern-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ism" into prose and poetry and the rediscovery of 17th-century literature. Yet this has only reached the schools in bits, and has not much remoulded ways of thinking, since most students, in my experience, are uneasy with literature that is not smooth and regular or has distinct ideas in it that demand logical thinking-out.

To be up-to-date is not simply a matter of putting new books on the syllabus. One has also to cleanse one's mind of lurking fallacies, e.g. that we are less able to make up our minds about very recent art, or historical events, or new theories, than about ones that time has winnowed for us. At Lancaster we have a Department of French Studies (not of French only), and it follows the new way of starting from the present. The first year syllabus includes Zola's *J'Accuse* and Sorel's *Réflexions Sur La Violence* and Henri Alleg's *La Question*, the poetry of Eluard and Aragon, Camus' *L'Etranger* and some of Sartre's philosophy and his novel *Les Mains Sales*: in short, about half the list is the cream of modern French radical and Marxist writing, purely because that in fact represents a true and balanced view of what has been most worthwhile in recent French work. (The professor, of course, though far from left-wing, has been twitted for his Red syllabus.) This seems to me a perfect model of educational practice—partly in that it is an "area study", i.e. one that moves freely between literature (and other arts), sociology, philosophy, and history; partly in that it starts from the present; and partly in that it is not afraid to look progressive if that is the way the material itself points.

Science and Life

The Sciences, it might be thought, are up-to-date almost by definition. Yet science in schools and universities seems to have opted out from imparting something of how its experimental findings must needs permeate our *ideas about life*. This view was put to me by a group of postgraduates working for higher degrees in physics, chemistry, biology. They felt their specialisms were failing to feed into the general intellectual culture. They had been made for years—ever since O-level—to concentrate severely on specialist topics, experimental method, etc. They had not been led to develop the philosophical consequences of the concepts basic to their science, e.g. evolution, entropy, indeterminacy. And the damage is two-fold: since 20th-century scientists have not philosophised and popularised their ideas with anything like the vigorous conviction of say, Darwinians like Thomas Huxley—J. B. S. Haldane was a magnificent exception—this has left it for intellectuals who hover between Arts and Sciences, like Michael Polanyi and Arthur Koestler, to take up ideas such as Heisenberg's law of indeterminacy and misuse them in support of a quite unscientific fallacy to the effect that nowadays even science is basically uncertain, so opening the door to mystifications and defeatisms of all kinds.

As for the schools, my information is out-of-date. Yet those postgraduates were voicing just the lack I felt myself, twenty years ago in a Scottish grammar school, when I had to plug away through five, to me gruelling, years of chemistry, physics, and biology (to the equivalent of between O- and A-level) and in all that time got no continuous instruction in, or explicit analysis of, such utterly basic ideas as evolution or the material nature of mental processes. *Most people*—I have found in hundreds of discussion-groups of all kinds up and down the country—are still thoroughly confused about the 100 per cent material nature of our emotional, intellectual being and physical being, about how we came to be here at all, and about how the universe hangs together as a complex of evolving material processes. Yet it is a century now since Darwin and Marx worked out the *basis* for a sensible, unillusioned view of life and nearly a century since the Education Acts provided for an organisation in which that view could have been imparted to everybody!

To my mind, the most direct and teachable way of overcoming the near-uselessness of school science for those who are never going to specialise in it, and its dangerous distancing from life for the future specialists, would be to make the main topics in the first few years of secondary education ones that are basic to everyday life—e.g. man as an animal (evolution, basic genetics, the material basis of thought and feeling), the origins of the world and its place in the universe, the science of growth, food-supply, and health. These would be taught by strictly scientific methods so that, in learning them, all pupils would get a working knowledge of measurement, the laws of evidence, different kinds of calculation, etc. Then, when some pupils left school, others went on with the sciences, and others again began to specialise in Arts, the former two classes of pupil would take with them something of abiding relevance to their day-by-day thinking and the latter class would have come to realise the bearing of their specialism on life even while they acquired the elements of their future profession.

Specialisation

Already some of the points made have belonged to (ii), Specialisation, and (iii), More doesn't mean worse. On (ii), science specialists seem commonly to be over-jealous about their own field: they tend to argue as though their own specialism, whichever it is, is *the* one that is so complex, so far-flung and demanding and indispensable to mankind, that it above all must not be diluted at any cost. Physical

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

scientists seem more inclined than technologists, social scientists, or "pure Arts" teachers to resist letting their students spend more than token time on subjects not directly useful to the central specialism. They argue that the best pupils in physics, mathematics, or whatever want to make certain of the best possible degree, so as to step up into the best possible jobs, and therefore must not be sidetracked from this whole profitable process. In fact the word has been going round recently that it is the science departments with the *most* limited curricula that are falling furthest short of filling their places each session and are doing worse than those where science specialists must put in some serious work on a subject some way away from their specialism. (E.g. the University of Lancaster has filled its physics places in its first two years of working, whereas last session Liverpool filled only 60 out of 110.) We have therefore to work against the mercenary, and mistaken, notion that what seems the most success-minded and go-ahead type of training is necessarily what people want.

Many of us in our teaching are forever having to assure students that it is not mere diligence and rote-work with the set texts, or the bare syllabus and that only, that get good results; that they cannot make the most of even the set assignments unless they have ranged around and outside the syllabus for themselves. Yet a great many students are plainly sceptical of this, or cannot nerve themselves to act on it. Our meritocratic culture, with its rigid grading and streaming, its repeated testing, the inequalities between parts of the educational system, and all the rest of the inquisitorial apparatus, has conditioned young people to think that if they work the system to the letter, they cannot go wrong, and that time not spent working directly for the next hurdle in the steeplechase is time wasted. So if the teacher ranges off on to something not in the syllabus, something that cannot be potted and stored up for the next exam, pens are put down, grins appear that seem to say, "There he goes again, this dilettante who hasn't his feet on the hard ground of the 20th century". This is the cynicism of the salesman, which we should resist in every way: by using marks as little as possible; by using lectures to open up perspectives, not to spoon-feed; by putting, as much as possible, small theses, or projects, or other personal work in place of exams with their deliver-the-goods effect.

More Doesn't Mean Worse

The next point mingles (i), Education for life, and (iii), More doesn't mean worse. More and more students are coming into higher education who have not had much in their homes in the way of books or family experience of undergoing advanced training and then applying it in work. The worst effects of this—the widened gap between parents and children, the lack of guidance from elders, the way in which working-class children then tend to fall over forwards to be more bourgeois than the bourgeoisie—all this has been studied systematically in *Education and the Working Class* by Brian Jackson and Dennis Marsden (1962; *Pelican*, 1966). Clearly, much of this is bound to follow from the widening opportunities for higher education. But more could be done, not only to lessen the bad side, but even to turn it to positive advantage educationally. For example: Arts courses have traditionally been based on "the best"—the most elaborate and finished work in the fine arts and literature, the most systematic and completed thought in philosophy, the doings of élites in political history, etc.

We now find that a boy or girl, especially a boy, from a working-class home, and especially one whose accent is still markedly vernacular, tends to be sceptical of such an emphasis and resistant to it. He feels how it runs against the grain of his own culture. He feels, and will often say, that he is having certain tastes imposed on him, especially an unnecessarily exclusive kind of standard in the arts. For the fact is that the "best", i.e. the most perfected and refined, has by and large been the product of the well-to-do: "The ruling ideas of each age have ever been the ideas of the ruling class." Higher education has not yet gone far enough to meet the culture of the majority.

The underlying principle—often disguised, even to itself, in a concern for "standards"—has been, "Encourage the barbarians to better themselves, and become more amenable generally, by supplying them with a veneer of civilisation". Of course I am not arguing that higher education should try to get with the culture of the hit parade, the *Daily Mirror*, and ITV! But there are now a number of growing-points in higher studies which must be developed at undergraduate, technical-college, and school levels as soon as possible, because they all lead in the same direction: i.e. the study of how *most people* earn their livelihoods, think, feel, suffer, and contribute to the total national culture. This work includes: Peter Townsend, Brian Abel-Smith, Hannah Gavron, and many many others in the sociology of British life (compared with the old sociological stress on primitive peoples); Richard Titmuss in the economics of poverty and inequality; E. P. Thompson, Eric Hobsbawm, and others in grass-roots social history; Brian Jackson and Brian Simon in the sociology and history of education; R. D. Laing in the psychology of our basic personal relationships; Richard Hoggart and Raymond Williams in literary-cultural studies; A. L. Lloyd in popular music . . . and even that impressive list is very insular, and shows my own ignorance, for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there are many Continental and American sociologists, for example, who have greatly furthered the study of what may be called ordinary behaviour, basic institutions, social life at the grass-roots instead of the upper-crust.

Hopeful Signs

Hitherto this work has fed too slowly into the general circulation—meaning mainly the schools—which it needs if it is to help change society. However, the syllabuses of the new universities are now studded with hopeful signs. At the University of Warwick (largely, no doubt, because Edward Thompson is its Reader in Labour History) the following courses can be taken: among the first-year options in History and Politics, Mass communications and Propaganda from 1776: newspapers, broadsheets, sermons, etc., especially regarding the French Revolution, 1848, the Great War; among the 3rd-year History courses, Technology and Science, 1450-1650, and Printing and Propaganda, 1450-1650: sermons, woodcuts, cartoons, propagandist drama, etc.; plus a 3rd-year special course, either Transition to Industrialism (studies of Lyons, Silesia and Ireland compared with the English experience) or *Sans-culottes* and Socialists (artisan Jacobins, milennialism, utopianism).

At the University of Sussex, the options in History (if it is studied in the School of Social Studies) include Civil War, Revolutions, Peasant Societies and Movements, Imperialism and Nationalism, Cities and Industry, Aristocracies and Elites, Labour Movements, Armies and Politics, Chartism, and Poverty 1885-1914; and in the School of English and American Studies, joint courses in History and Literature or Philosophy and Literature can include one of the following special topics—Poetry, Science, and Religion in the 17th century; the Industrial Revolution and the English Literary Imagination; the French Revolution and the Romantic Movement; the Late Victorian Revolt in Literature, Politics, and Culture. From this alone one can say (adapting Engels on the coal-miners in 1844) that at last our university Arts departments have been "torn from the intellectual death in which they had hitherto lain, have left their sleep, and have entered the movement of civilisation".

G.C.E. Subjects

As with all educational matters, however, the advance needs to be made at many points simultaneously. After repeated efforts some universities still cannot fill their Chairs of Sociology and one is told by people who know the whole field that there is a chronic severe shortage of sociologists in Britain. No professors, therefore no departments, therefore no undergraduates now, therefore no professors in another twenty years. We need, therefore, to make a bid for modern social and kindred studies *as GCE subjects*. The school curricula are still lumbered with material left over from the days when most university students were intending clergymen or sons of landowners waiting for their fathers to die off. The basic pattern is all too traditional—history, languages, the physical sciences. The one element at all new is the various environmental studies—biology, geography, and now economics. But here again is a failure on the purely human side: we study *arrangements* but lag in our study of human nature itself.

There is no intrinsic reason whatsoever why sociology, psychology, industrial relations, and anthropology should not come in as GCE subjects. This is vastly overdue, and there are kindred lags on the technical side: a few schools have brought in engineering and applied science subjects, but the amount being done is absurdly paltry if one thinks of how much our civilisation hinges on such work. The report of the Oxford University Education Department to the Robbins Committee on "The Sixth Form and Technology" argued the case for schools technology, and now a school has opened (the Salesian College at Netherton, near Liverpool) with laboratories specially designed for electronics, electro-technology, and engineering (processes and materials). The assembling and aligning of the apparatus was done by apprentices from industry, and instructors from industry advised on what experiments would be suitable for schoolboys to do. In short, British education is at last moving towards the polytechnic method now thirty years old in other parts of the world.[1]

New Studies

We should always, therefore, keep our eye on the principle that new studies should come in in the schools as well as in the further institutions, without unnecessary lags. But the point at which to begin has to be found—instructors are needed first or there can be no class, and the further institution has to produce the instructors. The dilemma is that the further institution may find few entrants for the new subjects unless some way has been found of making them known in the schools. But at least if sufficient graduates are produced with at least a side interest in one of the new subjects, then these men and women, when they go out to teach, will begin adapting their subjects, bending the old "science" or "humanity" or whatever it may be in the direction of the new emphasis, so that history in the schools will begin to grow in the direction of sociology, physics in the direction of applied science, and so on.

[1] E.g., see S. and B. Webb, *Soviet Communism: A New Civilisation* (1944 ed.), ch. 10 (c).

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I am afraid I would expect such progressive adaptations to go forward more purposively in the sciences than in the arts. The arts are still in a state of *laissez-faire*, by and large. There are fine new potential growing-points, e.g. the Institute for Contemporary Cultural Studies, run by Richard Hoggart and Stuart Hall, in the University of Birmingham. It does interesting things, but it is very much a loose association of graduates—of whoever comes along with a bright idea and signs on. By contrast, some of the other new centres, especially those in which *arrangements* are studied, e.g. university departments of Marketing and Operational Research, plan whole curricula for post-graduate work and go out of their way to deliberately attract entrants, as much from industry and commerce as from among new graduates. Management is interested because it knows it will get better-quality recruits.

Could the universities not similarly gear themselves to the many, many bodies that do social-cum-cultural work, especially the mass media? At last a few universities have drama departments, and include on-stage project work in the literary study of plays. But Britain still has no Cinema School (compare Poland!) and we still, in what we pick out for study at a high level, behave as though, say, cinema, television, and radio were less likely to produce significant and mind-forming new work than the printed media.

Middle Class History

It is this hide-bound bookiness which, among other things, gives the thoroughly working-class student a feeling that the culture of the universities is alien to him. This affects what he studies as well as his happiness. From an annual intake of about 300 students one expects about 5 to leave *not* because of failing exams, and there will usually be several others whose exam-failure conceals kindred personal reasons, and the majority of these drop-outs are usually people who have felt over-faced by the middle-class tone of university.

As for the effect on what is studied, one finds that *most* students of literature (and a good many in history) have a crestfallen idea of Western civilisation. They have little faith in literacy and technology. They speak (though this can hardly represent the whole of their thinking) as if Western life were a rat-race down a Gadarene slope with some unspecified morass waiting for us at the foot. If this took the form of conscious resistance to the way we are being dragged—economically, politically, and culturally—behind the band-wagon of American imperialism, it would be all to the good. In practice it comes out more as a pervasive dislike of change, or a sense that change has gone far enough.

It is the attitude A. J. P. Taylor was hitting off when he said that "if historians speak of the decline of civilisation, it usually means that now they have to wash their own dishes". Students fresh from school turn out time after time to have succumbed to the defeatism of William Golding's *Lord of the Flies* with its implication (crudely, and therefore memorably, simplified in the school edition of the novel) that "civilisation is only a thin veneer". And this disgruntlement—essentially that of the well-to-do who have found that affluence is neither a panacea nor causes history to stop at the present convenient stage—is as likely to be found in working-class children as in middle class. That is what traditional history and literature teaching have done—equipped people with negative bourgeois clichés. My students say, "In the Victorian age a girl could only meet a man along with a chaperone". The mill-girls didn't need chaperones! Yet that is what higher education has done, encouraged its products to speak as though history were the history of the middle class, as though "people" means the bourgeoisie. The need to modernise our studies is as acute as that.

Model Syllabuses

I propose, therefore, that various groups in close touch with classroom work, school *along with* further institutions, should draft some *model syllabuses* (e.g. in history, literature, cultural studies, sociology, and area studies that combine more than one of the above) aimed at showing how, with no lowering of standards, the materials to be studied can draw much more than hitherto on the commonest stuff (e.g. popular music and printed matter, mass behaviour, local material). We have made suggestions like this before: it was more than eight years ago that the then Historians' Group wrote:

> . . . the story of technological change illustrates in the clearest possible way that history is a matter of cause and effect, and, too, of human progress; as opposed to the view that history has nothing to teach, no meaning nor pattern . . . it is precisely here that the history of technique is so valuable because progress in this field is clear. True, at times there is a standstill, at times some techniques are lost; but others develop and there is never total retrogression.[2]

Have any syllabuses of that kind been put into practice in the eight years since? If not, it looks as though we must work out new ways of interesting people in our ideas.

What was said above about some of the good things on new-university syllabuses has already brought together heads (iv), Arts and Sciences, and (v), Crossing the inter-subject boundaries. Area

[2] "The Teaching of History": *Marxism Today* (Jan. 1959), 30.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

studies instead of "subjects", Schools (e.g. at Sussex and East Anglia) instead of "faculties"—such things show how education is growing, and the contents of the new courses, the biases of the lecturers, the willingness to experiment show strikingly how *progressive* is the present orientation of further education. It is concerned with the study of revolution, conflict, and radical change, with radical thought and the more fluid media of opinion, with the areas of behaviour where social betterment can most readily be carried out. The pity of it is that the social change that such thought and study should flow into, if it is to complete itself, will all be blocked, skimped, or delayed by the incurable poverty of our Mixed Economy and our enslavement to America. British theory has rarely been better; its practice remains abject.

Arts and Sciences

Although boundaries are thus being crossed, the one between Arts and Sciences remains tricky. All sorts of well-meaning noises are being made but the sense of where to begin is still foggy. The University of York plans a 5-year dual degree in science and arts or social sciences, "to add to the number of professional people concerned to promote the arts and the sciences with equal conviction and understanding". Negotiations on the extra LEA grants needed have proved difficult—which is understandable, as it seems doubtful whether it is right to offer this chance to integrate the two "sides" only to those able to spend an extra two years at university; and at first only one subject, English, came forward to offer courses for the arts component of the dual degree.

The University of Warwick puts on a general course which "All undergraduates in Arts and Science are expected to attend"—the wording (from the Prospectus) makes it sound as though this integration is optional and therefore less likely to be taken seriously than the specialisms; and the content of the course makes one boggle—one lecture plus one seminar per week "in which the methods of the various branches of knowledge such as mathematics, natural and social sciences, literary criticism, ethics and politics will be examined". It sounds like swallowing the encyclopaedia.

At Lancaster the first-year student takes three subjects, and with only a few exceptions most departments let their intending Major students choose freely: an intending Chemistry Major can make up his first year from Chemistry plus Maths. or Biology or Physics or Environmental Studies plus anything from Classical Background to Politics; an intending Major in English can take English plus Physics plus Environmental Studies, if he likes. Our standard advice to entrants is that it is wise to take at least one non-school subject. In the second year the general principle is that a student takes a Major, a Minor (both of which he continues to graduation), and a distant or complementary subject, but in practice only the Arts subjects and Biology have honoured this principle—Chemistry allow nothing more distant than Biology or Physics or Environmental Studies, Mathematics nothing more distant than Computer Science! Thus, after a broad first-year—with, on paper, room for more integration than most other places I have looked up (Keele is still the shining exception)—Lancaster's second-year narrows to pure science for the scientist and for the arts student pure arts plus one year's science (his "distant" subject). Even this breadth is more a paper than a practical matter: in practice very few students are willing to combine, on the one hand, courses that study natural forces and work by measurement and, on the other, courses that study human behaviour and work with words.

Also, the second-year "distant" subject has aroused sharp resistance among students: the literature or history person says mutinously, "We didn't come here to cut up rats"—a brief travesty of the "Biology and Man" course, which in fact is very like the science for non-specialists that I sketched under (i) above. Since this is a democracy, we should of course let students vote on the matter, and they would no doubt vote to get back on to familiar (specialist) ground as soon as possible. For myself I believe that nine months spent on something that seemed unappetising at the time is a worthwhile experience educationally in that the student then knows for good, in his mind and muscles, what a certain kind of study quite different from his own is like. But this is a weak argument "politically", and the "distant" subject, slender enough though it is as a gesture towards integration, is constantly in danger of being trimmed till it counts for little of the final degree and also of having the distance taken out of it.

So this area is still dogged with perplexities. If Arts/Science integration is concrete enough to make some difference, it meets resistance from students conditioned to specialise by the GCE. If it is made inoffensively general, or optional, it looks little more than a varnish of "general knowledge" and liberal intentions. Apart from Keele, the most promising scheme to date seems to be the University of Manchester's:

> The suggestion is for a School of Liberal Studies in Science. The graduates of such a school, we must suppose, will be able straight away to take their place in the world, just as B.A.s and M.A.s do now. If they want to become specialist scientists they will,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

no doubt, go on to acquire post-graduate qualifications.[3]

This would at least mean thorough integration for three years, although it would still, like the York "dual degree", unfairly benefit those willing to spend 5+ years at university. It seems to me that our educational system will not be right, will not equip people to make sense of modern knowledge, until it is the rule, instead of the exception, for students to begin with something like the Keele "Foundation Year" (equal attention to arts and sciences). To prepare people for this, artificial specialism must not be built in at a still earlier stage, and towards this I suggest the kind of science course sketched above, in which principles of measurement, experiment, and evidence were thoroughly instilled but applied to subject-matter of direct human concern, e.g. health, food, evolution, personality and mental life.

Divergers and Convergers

At present our teaching, both at school and further on, only intensifies the tendency of the "Arts type" to rely on eloquence, unbacked personal opinionating, and value-judgments, and the tendency of the "Science type" to skirt round human problems and belittle whatever cannot be objectively assessed. It may be objected that there are no such types, that the bias comes from conditioning. Yet one of the most pioneering new pieces of educational research suggests the contrary. Liam Hudson of King's College, Cambridge, has given tests, some standard IQ but also elaborate open-ended ones, to some hundreds of boys going on to A-level in English schools. He has found so marked a difference between intending arts specialists, with their verbal bias of ability, and the science ones, with numerical/diagrammatic biases, that he believes there are two types, divergers and convergers: the former excel at open-ended tests, which for example ask the boy to name *as many uses as possible* for an object, the latter score poorly in such tests. Most Arts specialists are comparatively weak at IQ tests and much better at the open-ended; the Science specialists are the reverse. The typical intending historian or modern linguist has a comparatively low IQ, a verbal bias of intelligence, works erratically at the tests themselves, and has "cultural" rather than practical interests; the intending physical scientist has a high IQ, a non-verbal bias, works hard and accurately at the tests, and has technical, mechanical, and outdoor interests. The results were as true of 13- and 14-year-olds as of boys of 15 and upwards, i.e. they reveal that the types are there *before A-level specialisation* and are not a product of it.[4]

Boundary Crossing

Hudson's analysis of his results is extremely careful and subtle. He stresses that he is working with a spectrum on which the "perfect" converger and the "perfect" diverger are the extremes: most people would have a less decided bias one way or the other. Nevertheless it seems we must recognise that a good deal of the Arts/Science bias is "given", by heredity and early upbringing (Hudson makes some pregnant guesses at how relations between children and parents condition people in the convergent or divergent direction).

This may sound an unpromising, even a reactionary ending to an argument for integration; but in the first place we must know the facts before we draw up our well-meaning plans, and secondly Marxists have often talked too blithely about the division of knowledge (and the division of labour) as though the desirability of ending it led automatically to the possibility of doing so. Given that the division is at least partially inherent, here are two proposals for lessening its worst effects: first, liaison groups including teachers from both schools and further institutions should plan experiments in boundary-crossing, e.g. by gearing the General Studies periods (at present wildly variegated in content) to the area studies and boundary-crossing courses of specific universities; second, the groups should plan some model syllabuses in "Arts-type" science and in human studies for scientists, at both school and further levels.

[3] Magnus Pyke, "Designing a Modern University": *Listener*, 1966 (October 6), 499.

[4] Liam Hudson, *Contrary Imaginations* (1966), esp. 20, 22, 42-7.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Art, Science and Architecture

W. H. Evans

IT has in large measure been due to Marxist scholarship that the unity of culture in primitive society is now widely acknowledged. Magic and and science, art and craft—all are now commonly accepted as interwoven aspects of the early struggle of man to come to terms with and control his environment. Today's divisions into art and science —still less the sub-species "fine art", "folk art", "applied art", "pure" and "applied" science, etc.— have no meaning for the savage or barbarian. How strange it is then that so much of our discussion today takes these categories for granted. Our art critics discuss "art" and our science correspondents "science" without much questioning today's divisions: tacitly, therefore, accepting the premises on which they are based.

I am not aware of any study which traces over the whole spectrum the evolution of today's divided concepts from their prehistoric origins. Such a study would be far beyond my capacity and impossible in a single short article. The question does however arise quite sharply in architecture which has at times been claimed equally by art and science. A survey of this more limited field may therefore reveal something more generally applicable.

Origin of the Architect

Etymology can be of some help. The word "architect" comes from two Greek roots: *arkhos*, a chief or leader; and *tekton*, a carpenter or builder. *Tekton* is related to the Sanskrit *taksan*, a carpenter, to the Latin *texere*, to weave or construct, and to the Greek *tekhne* meaning skill or art. From the same roots, our "technical" words derive—and it is straightaway of significance that "technique", "technology", etc., are now paradoxically used to distinguish the cold-blooded and scientific from "art".

The Homeric references to the architect are indeed in the sense of a foreman and skilled workman, and it is not until civilisation is established that we can identify him as a person distinct from either the craftsman or the political leader. With both of these he remains throughout history to some extent entangled. A designer must of course have some knowledge of craftsmanship, and there are consequently many architects who have "risen from the ranks". Often also, as still happens today, a powerful patron or official would not hesitate to claim for himself the honour of having designed an admired work. But there is little doubt that since the first large-scale works associated with the building of cities, the role of architect has been closely linked with government. If not always (as tradition says of Imhotep) a prince, the architect has often been at least a priest or senior official, sharing the prejudices and outlook of the ruling class.

Such a position in early class society would of course be an inevitable result of the supervisory and organisational tasks of architecture. But Bernal draws attention also to equally important ideological considerations. Calculation, estimation, delineation, and the entire process of the design and supervision of public works is a sophisticated intellectual exercise involving the use of knowledge possessed only by the privileged. Especially was mathematics required—the mystery which, since it could govern practice without becoming involved in it, was (unlike manual labour) a fit pursuit for an aristocrat.

By Augustan times civilisation had advanced the division of labour to such a degree that the professional architect can be distinguished, and one of their number—Vitruvius—has provided us with the only work on architecture to come down from pre-Renaissance times.

Vitruvius on Architecture

Vitruvius appears to have developed a professional career from military beginnings. He is anxious to promote the dignity of his calling as being worthy of a gentleman, and at times one catches something of the smugness of today's self-made man. To the modern reader, two things stand out in his account. The first is his attempt to find for everything a scientific explanation and rational cause. The second is his scope. Architecture for Vitruvius was the science of designing everything from timepieces to cities, from catapults and ballistae to country mansions. In short, what he writes of would today come nearer to what we call "technology". He even makes a clear distinction between the mathematician and the architect, similar to that now made between the pure scientist and the technologist.

What does he say of "art"? What of beauty? Considering all that in the name of architecture has since been written, remarkable little. But what he does say makes it clear that for him *venustas* (gracefulness) was inextricably involved in the practical matters of *utilitas* and *stabilitas*. It has even recently been argued that in emphasising the importance of proportion and measurement (a key subject in architectural aesthetics) he was concerned as much

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with practical matters as with any other. The use of a "module" to ensure that all parts fit together was as sound practice in Roman times as it is with modern factory production. The choice of parts of the body (hand, foot, span, forearm, etc.) for standards in a dimensional system makes abundant sense in an age lacking other yardsticks. Vitruvius in recording the proportional relationships between these parts probably had little thought for the mysteries others have since read into them. Even in requiring the architect to know something of music, he had in mind as much the "tuning" of catapults as "canonical theory", and insofar as the latter leads to the number magic of the Pythagoreans, this, for Vitruvius, would have appeared equally reasonable and "scientific".

Middle Ages

The succeeding Middle Ages have left us scant records. We have partial accounts of various buildings, among them Abbot Suger's record of the building of his church at St. Denis in the 12th century. He describes how he brought together craftsmen from all over Christendom to fashion a new building for which, his account suggests, he was the architect. That professionals still existed however we know from the celebrated fragments of the notebook of Villard, the 13th century master. He writes in the "vulgar tongue" and addresses himself to his fellow-craftsmen who, like himself it would seem, were sometimes called upon to design as well as build. And his interest extends to machines as well as to figure drawings and the planning of churches —an indication that the mediaeval master was, like the Roman architect, still a versatile man.

The Renaissance Architect

Out of the mediæval master in large measure evolved the "universal man" of the Renaissance. Others have pointed out that in its earliest phase, the Renaissance is remarkable in history in that for a short time scholars in their pursuit of wisdom, looked as much to practice as to theory. In telling contrast to the patrician disdain of manual labour attributed to such great thinkers as Archimedes, it was said of Alberti (the second great author in history of a work on architecture):

> "He would learn from all, questioning smiths, builders, shipwrights and even shoemakers lest any might have some uncommon or secret knowledge. . . ."

In the early Renaissance, the unity of culture was reasserted with an earnestness and consistency which borders on naïveté. But for all its greatness in spirit, it failed to match in practice its discoveries in thought. Could it be that the much-admired art of the period is the most striking expression of precisely its technical limitations? Gombrich writes of Leonardo:

> "Today we read of Leonardo's project to build a 'flying machine', but if we look into Leonardo's notes we will not find such an expression. What he wants to make is a bird that will fly, and once more there is an exultant tone in the master's famous prophecy that the bird *would* fly. It did not . . . The claim to be a creator, a maker of things, passed from the painter to the engineer—leaving to the artist only the small consolation of being a maker of dreams."

Perhaps unable to achieve in reality the perfection promised by omniscience and a rational outlook, the men of the Renaissance sought it most brilliantly in products removed from an intractable world to the untrammelled realm of the spirit. In his letter to the Duke of Milan, Leonardo speaks of himself more as inventor than artist, and perhaps without exaggeration we may agree that Leonardo the painter is da Vinci the frustrated engineer, creating on paper the mastery of nature he could not achieve in life.

Alberti

Alberti, in terms no less all-embracing than Vitruvius, has amply recorded what architecture meant to a 15th century Florentine. Still intensely scientific in its approach and practical in its subject matter, his Ten Books deal more searchingly with the question of beauty as being "what architecture chiefly aims at". This has inevitably contributed to an intellectual climate which has since removed architecture (as much else) from the realm of experimental science and placed it with the fine arts of modern times. It would be outside our scope here to discuss his theory of beauty in detail, but we can note that he is always at pains to emphasise that ". . . beauty and ornament . . . conveniency and strength . . . have such a mutual agreement that where any one of these is wanting the others also lose their commendation." What is here of more significance, is his advice to the architect to concern himself with none but ". . . persons of the highest rank and quality, and those too such as are truly lovers of these arts . . .", and his dismissal from the province of architecture "anything that is immediately necessary for any particular purpose, and about which there is no doubt of what sort it should be, or of the ability of the owner to afford it . . . (This) is not so much the business of an architect as of a common workman . . .'

In the economic conditions of nascent capitalism, this can be accepted as an opportune recognition that (as presumably throughout history) most humble homes and other buildings were inevitably designed and built by their users. But there is also in Alberti's argument an eagerness to assert that architecture is something worthy of an educated

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

man and different entirely from the affairs of the village craftsman. Leonardo's defence of painting in the *Paragone* is better known and in more defiant vein, but in its consequences Alberti's attitude was for succeeding generations the more far-reaching.

The Initial Split

For with few exceptions, we find that it is upon grand villas, monuments and temples that succeeding writers concentrate. Within a century of Alberti's death, architecture had become a matter of the "correct" design of dignified buildings. By 1700, the word was applied to a properly proportioned and decorated edifice to single it out from what Wren calls "vulgar contiguous buildings". We find an occasional writer who reminds his readers that, on classical authority, the province of architecture extends over a much wider field. But in practice its territory had contracted to select individual buildings, and its principal concern had become their formal excellence. This paradoxically was to occur at the very time when the scientific revolution of the 17th century laid the intellectual basis for a changed technique and manufacture which were in increasing measure to demand new towns, new machines, new modes of transport on an unprecedented scale. The architect thus became fettered to dying methods and attitudes, and his renounced opportunity for inventive design was seized by others. These in time, having learnt to combine skill and understanding acquired as smith, millwright or instrument maker with the new mechanical science, became the engineers of the Industrial Revolution.

From this initial split the modern professions associated with designing in every field have developed, and provide the most apparent evidence of our modern "two cultures". On the one side are the architects, deriving in unbroken line from a remote history, classed in the main with the "arts". On the other, are the engineers of various kinds, firmly based upon the mechanical sciences. A few "splinter groups"—industrial designers, town planners, various technologists—participate on one side or the other. Supporters and coaches, as it were, line the touchlines: on one side painters, sculptors and representatives of the "literary culture"; on the other the physicists, the chemists and the mathematicians.

An Unreal Division

Thus an unreal division in the world of practice is mirrored throughout the whole of modern culture. Although increasingly challenged by theorists on both sides, the popular conception persists of architecture as a matter of aesthetics and of engineering as a matter of efficiency, each with a distinct and definable territory. There is a naïve belief that somehow the one can contrive beauty without caring "how it works", and the other utility without caring "what it looks like". From the venerable and once indissoluble trinity of "firmnesse, commoditie and delight", delight has been handed to the architect, firmness to the engineer, and commodity (as our modern surroundings daily remind us) has been left to take care of itself.

The untenability of this position has now long been apparent. Morris was among the first to assail it in the 19th century, and his successors in today's Modern Movement have brought up to date some of his arguments and added new ones of their own. But no one had yet (so far as I know) analysed and answered the many problems it raises.

While in the main it now renounces what is recognised as a crude over-simplification, the Modern Movement in architecture has as yet found little to put in place of its early belief in a naïve functionalism, structural honesty, and the like. Its literature abounds with the vague verbiage of modern art criticism and its practitioners have produced little yet which can be ranked with the advanced products of 20th century technology. Its principal propagandist (until his recent death) le Corbusier proves, for all his brilliant innovation, to be at heart as neo-Platonist as Palladio.

Less vociferous than the architects, the engineers and technologists nonetheless have their views on the matter, of which no practising designer can long remain unaware. For most, the mechanist reasoning which forms the basis of their practice, leads them to regard those aspects of design which are not readily susceptible to the laws of mechanics as irrational superficialities to which are given the name "aesthetics".

Shifting Boundaries

The problems are today the more pressing in that the inherited boundaries and divisions as between architect and engineer, between "art" and "technology", are daily shifting. The factory production of buildings will move much more from the sphere of traditional architectural practice into the hands of other designers. Whole sections of towns, with their transport systems and engineering services are the typical civic design problem of tomorrow. Vehicles, oil-distillation plants, appliances, roadways, airports will contribute as much or more to our "visual comfort" as have the stately homes and town halls of the past. Concert halls, workshops and schools can today command as scientific an approach to their design as can machine tools. Our divided professions grew up in the heyday of *laissez-faire* individualism, when the relatively small-scale project on an isolated site could be designed by one man or an *ad hoc* consortium of specialists. Today, the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

private practitioner is being replaced by the salaried design team of the manufacturer, contractor or public authority.

Beauty and Efficiency Reconciled?

Thus architecture is having to reckon in practice with the split imposed on it by capitalist conditions. Will it overcome the split which has resulted in its theory? How can we reconcile this business of beauty and efficiency, of feeling and knowing, of fine art and technology?

In architectural theory various attempts are made to find an answer. Perhaps the most promising is that which extends the functionalist doctrine "form follows function" into a generalised utilitarian aesthetics. "Function" is more widely interpreted to include not only mundane "practical" matters, but also the giving of pleasure, of emotional stimulus, of "delight". What effectively is asserted, is the unity of culture, from which art and science are merely partial abstractions. For men bring to their activity (whether listening to a symphony or operating a lathe) a total capacity for comprehension, ranging from the warmest passion to the coldest reason, from sub-conscious reaction to calculated decision. The most successfully designed object will therefore be that which enlists from its users the maximum appropriate response. The arrangement of an instrument panel is susceptible to the same approach as the design of a dance hall. Clearly the appeal in one case will be more to conscious reasoned processes, in the other more to the emotions, but in neither will both elements be entirely absent. Satisfactory use thus becomes a test of excellence, and functionalism thus widely interpreted proves an adequate philosophy.

Problems

But some objections remain. Some admittedly useful things are not directly used, or are used by different people in different ways. This is easily met by widening the concept of use to imply social use within a total situation. Drains contribute to the use of the house, and the house to the use of the town. To be wholly satisfactory all must "work" equally well for resident as well as passer-by. Another objection is much more fundamental and brings me to what often appears as a central issue in art criticism—the existence as a qualitatively distinct category of the "fine arts". The point has been raised by Gropius (a pioneer of modern architecture) who wrote:

> "There is a widespread heresy that art is just a useless luxury. This is one of our fatal legacies from a generation which arbitrarily elevated some of its branches above the rest as the 'Fine Arts', and in so doing robbed all of their basic identity and common life."

But we would need to go further and (if the criterion of usefulness is to apply throughout the whole spectrum of human creation and activity) assert the utility of the fine arts—something which by distinguishing them from the "useful arts" the very category was meant to deny.

Marxism surely has always implied this utility in its recognition of the role of ideology in society. But much more is needed in detailed research before we can be satisfied that we can answer all the complex questions that are raised.

References

Bernal, J. D., *Science in History.*
Briggs, M. S., *The Architect in History.*
Vitruvius, *De Architectura* (trans. Morgan).
Scholfield, P.H., *The Theory of Proportion in Architecture.*
Panofsky, E., *Abbot Suger.*
Wilars de Honecourt (Villard), *Sketchbook* (Facsimile edition).
Alberti, L.B., *De Re Aedificatoria* (trans. Leoni).
Gombrich, E. H., *Art and Illusion.*
Da Vinci, Leonardo, *Paragone* (trans. Rechter).
Wren, C., *Tracts on Architecture.*
Gropius, W., *The New Architecture and the Bauhaus.*

1967 MARX MEMORIAL LECTURE

CENTENARY OF "CAPITAL" AND ITS RELEVANCE TODAY

Speaker: MAURICE DOBB
Chairman: Andrew Rothstein

FRIDAY, MARCH 17th 7.30 p.m.

CONWAY HALL, Red Lion Square, W.C.1.

Admission 1/- at door Questions

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Discussion Contributions on:

Some Problems Under Discussion

Maurice Dobb

PERHAPS it is out-of-order to straddle two separate discussions in one discussion-contribution? But brief comments occur to me, both in connection with T. L. Drinkwater's note in the January *Marxism Today* and with the "Homo sapiens" debate in which Professor Bernal has now joined.

Finance Capital

First, with regard to the former, T. L. Drinkwater's question strikes me as both pertinent and timely: why should "finance capital" as the "merging or concrescence of banks with industry" necessarily be interpreted as the invariable dominance of the former over the latter? To confine Lenin's notion (whatever Hilferding's may have been) to this one-way dominance has always struck me as an over-simplified interpretation; perhaps bearing some analogy with a similar one-way view of the relation between Monopoly Capital and the State of Monopoly Capitalism, which has bred some confusions in the past. (I refer to the supposition that in *this* coalescence the State is always and necessarily passive and can exert no reciprocal influence upon the structure and functioning of Monopoly Capital itself).

Is not the essence of Lenin's notion the increasing dominance of financial influences and motivation over industry; which may, surely, come about by large industrial combines converting themselves into, or spawning off, virtual finance companies as much as by the "classic" German method of investment bankers financing industry and holding a controlling interest in it—or by some mixture of the two lines of development? What else is a holding company, for example, than a financing-company and an organ of financial control, even though it may have *started* its career as an ordinary industrial company, concerned with production rather than with manipulation of share-values? What else was the famous Insull hierarchy of "pyramided" holding companies? Was not the top holding company of the pyramid which simply held shares in the next layer of holding companies and which was about as remote from production as anything could be, essentially an investment-bank without the name? Similarly the process of "internal accumulation", whereby large monopoly-concerns accumulate funds with which they finance their own or other firms' expansion, buy up subsidiaries and annex them to their own empire, can surely be part of the same general process.

Perhaps Ron Bellamy (or someone else) will tell us why this is an incorrect interpretation?

Population—Short-Term

Regarding population, it seems pretty clear (and with this Prof. Bernal agrees) that there can be, and in many parts of the world is, a *short-term* problem; and, if so, it is wrong for Marxists to take an entirely negative attitude to measures designed to control population-increase. But if there can be a short-term problem this side of socialism, I do not see how we can deny the possibility of there being one under socialism as well (since socialism lives in a succession of historically-determined short periods as much as capitalism). True, socialism will hold the potentiality of increasing productive powers to a very much greater extent than capitalism. But it will still have the task of building-up and developing productive power, as the experience of the socialist world has shown. Such building-up of productive power cannot be done without considerable effort (the effort involved in socialist capital accumulation); and it will remain true that a given development effort will yield a quicker rise in living standards (consumable production *per head*) if population increases slowly than if it increases fast. (It is *not* necessarily true that "the more human beings you have the richer *per head* you will be").

The Problem of Sizes

This last statement only needs qualification if there are positive economic advantages to production from large numbers: advantages such that *productivity* per worker (not merely *total* production) is increased solely because the scale of production is increased (what economists have termed "economies of scale"). At an early stage of development, and in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

relatively small countries, this may be an important consideration; and it is certainly a possibility that should be looked out for and carefully studied (if only to avoid the dogma of saying there always *is* a problem as well as to avoid the dogma of saying there *never* is).

But I am inclined to think that in countries anywhere near the size of the Soviet Union or China, or for that matter in a socialist world (or any community of socialist states) in which international division of labour has scope for development, advantages from further increase of mere scale cannot be appreciable. The scale on which nearly everything is produced is (or can be) sufficiently large for such "economies of scale" as exist to have been fully exploited. I would admit, however, that this is a matter on which one can never be *certain:* It is a matter of likely inference and probability-estimates, until experience *ex post facto* has afforded relevant evidence.

Long-Term

But when the "long period" problem is talked of, perhaps it is not Socialism, but rather Communism (where the problem of production has been already solved) to which reference is really being made. If Professor Bernal tells us that, under Communism, scientists will always be able to conjure any amount of extra production for us quite effortlessly, like rabbits out of a hat or manna from heaven, then I shall listen to him very respectfully. His compelling eloquence may even convince me that he is right. But unless he can show me that the possibility of this is not very far over the horizon, I think I shall continue to regard it as not very relevant to any propaganda, strategy or tactics in which Marxists should be engaging today.

Further Comments

If an idle reminiscence is permissible—in the peroration to my book on *Russian Economic Development since the Revolution* of nearly forty years ago I ventured to say: "The increase of population may well prove to require some kind of regulation as much as the other economic factors which Gosplan seeks to co-ordinate and to plan." This seemed a bold statement at the time. I do not remember its provoking any reaction on the left, either positive or negative; and I do not think I ever repeated it or returned to the theme. Little did I realise at the time that (as a citation in Ivor Montagu's article reveals) my statement was no more than an echo of Engels!

Two incidental comments in conclusion. Firstly, Marxist writers in their (rightful) zeal to dethrone Malthusianism sometimes seem to forget that its character as a reactionary philosophy consists, *not* in its stating the existence of a population problem, but in its elevating this problem to paramountcy among social problems, to the extent of asserting that all other measures for improving the lot of human beings are self-defeating and hence futile. Strumilin's point that as the standard of life rises the birth-rate tends to fall is an important element in the answer to Malthus's reactionary conclusion. But it is not necessarily a ground for complacency about the existence of a problem.

Secondly, on the *non*-economic advantages under Communism, of a large population ("all the world a Butlin's camp" and-all-that) it seems to me quite utopian to speculate. We just don't know what the tastes, inclinations and preferences of people under Communism (which, surely, must be decisive to any answer) will be!

In any case, I cannot see how any estimate of the value of having more human beings *as such* can be made independently of what is the existing number and of what the existing number collectively think about having more.

ACTA HISTORICA ACADEMIAE SCIENTIARUM HUNGARICAE

A periodical of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences

Editorial Board:

I. BEREND, L. ELEKES, E. LEDERER, ,
E. MALYUSZ, GY. MEREI, ZS. P. PACH
E. PAMLENYI (Responsible Editor),
F. PERENYI, F. POLOSKEI, GY. TOKODY,
T. WITTMANN, L. ZSIGMOND

ACTA HISTORICA publishes papers in the field of history including universal history, mediaeval history and modern history of Hungary. The treatises, published in English, French, German or Russian, with abstracts in a second language, are written by leading historians from Hungary and other countries.
ACTA HISTORICA is published twice a year making up a volume of some 400 to 500 pages.

Subscription rate per volume: 48s.
Distributors: **KULTURA, Budapest 62, P.O.B. 149**
Editorial Office: Budapest I. Uri utca 51-53

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

No Room for Homo sapiens?

A Reply to Discussion

Ivor Montagu

MARXISM TODAY has found space for ten contributions to the discussion "No Room for Homo sapiens?" opened last June, in addition to the article by Idris Cox, "World Hunger or Economic Aid", very relevant to one aspect.

These contributions have no doubt helped to clarify the subject. To see where we have got, it would, perhaps, be best to summarise, as briefly as possible, the argument with which we kicked off.

The subject has four separate aspects: the total populations in the total world; the special problem of the developing countries; future targets; what to do.

Four Propositions

I advanced the following propositions:

1. That the population problem (total of world population in relation to resources, and current rate of increase of the former in relation to current prospects of exploitation of the latter) has so changed in character since the middle of last century (the approximate date of the Marx-Malthus controversy) that a fresh look by Marxists is necessary.
2. That present indications make it not only probable but virtually certain that such a fresh look is not only necessary but urgent and overdue.
3. That, while the background of the classical polemic (viz. that Malthus, giving priority to population limitation and declaring social reorganisation futile without it, was talking harmful, reactionary, unscientific nonsense) remains entirely valid (on the contrary, only social reorganisation will make possible the total resolution of the problem), nevertheless the particular facts of every concrete situation must be studied to determine the priorities suitable and relevant to each; and that, further, in the concrete situation in many developing countries the present rate and character of population increase can militate against success in the struggle for social reorganisation.
4. That Marxism does not demand that we should believe either that an infinite increase in human population can be infinitely supplied and accommodated on earth or disposed of elsewhere in the solar system, and will produce the maximum happiness, prosperity and efficiency for individuals and mankind—indeed, presently available knowledge suggests that very likely it will not—and that, therefore, Marxists are not exempt from using their loaves to foresee probable ultimate targets and substitute, in this as in other matters of human destiny and welfare, at least the rudiments of planning in place of *laissez faire*.

Disagreements

Total disagreement with these propositions is to be found in the discussion from, I think, only Professor Strumilin and N. M. Seedo. Both their viewpoints show a faith which is touching but has little to do with Marxism as most people understand it or as it appears in the works of the founding fathers. Just as the religious faithful sleep sound at night in the comforting surety that the Lord will provide, so N. M. Seedo is convinced that Man can (and therefore will) provide, Professor Strumilin that prosperity will provide.

I do not want to belittle N. M. Seedo's faith. Without Humanism there would never have been any Marxism, and there is not a little evidence that, if this had been better remembered in practice, some at least of the errors and difficulties on the road to Communism could have been avoided. Nevertheless, it is not enough to declare that the people, and the people alone, are the beginning and end of everything. In a sense we all accept this, but we have to be analytic, and that means statistical, as well. On her desert island, one man is overpopulation. On a fruitful island, one is underpopulation. Oxfam, CND, and Socialism is not an adequate prescription. I do not believe N. M. Seedo understands that what we are talking about is not a possibility, but a probability, that unless man adequately prescribes he will not be able to flit to and fro between the towns and the beauty of the countryside because he will already be occupying both.

As for Professor Strumilin, he appears to have overlooked the circumstances, so well stressed by Jean Feldmar and Arab-Ogly, that the acute immediacy of the problem has less to do with the birth rate and most to do with the decrease in the death rate. Since measures to restore a high death rate (realistic nuclear war manoeuvres? mass mountain climbing?) are not likely to be acceptable,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

we are forced to look at, among other things, the birth rate. But even in the blinkered field he has chosen I am afraid his data are not "with it". It is true that, years ago, early statistical studies encouraged an optimistic belief that there might be a sort of self-regulating mechanism in society which would keep populations to the optimum figure, and that this mechanism might be found in the effects of prosperity. True also that prosperity, or the lack of it, is one obvious operative factor. The opening shot of "Whisky Galore", with its floods of kids pouring out of a cabin, reminds us of what can happen in the Highlands and Islands during the long winter nights without electrification; and a Soviet poetess of my acquaintance, reproaching a friend—a post office clerk—in Southern India for engaging in propagation in broad daylight in front of her hotel, received the not unreasonable reply: "Lady, with the price of cigarettes what it is you would limit one of the few pleasures we have left."

But there is very much more to it than that. Birthrate statistics over a longer period have shown frequent exceptions to the Strumilin law. Peter Latham has usefully reminded us of the influence of a fluctuating demand for labour. All kinds of ideological hangovers—religious habits stemming perhaps from feudal desire for serfs, warlords' desire for retainers or just a patriarch farmer's desire for hands—outlive their needs; an example was the Egyptian taxi driver who implied to us all on TV recently that doubt of his wisdom in adding to his already enormous brood would be equivalent to blasphemy. With respect, optimism of the Strumilin-Panurge variety is not enough in the present situation. The title of Arab-Ogly's article: "Scientific Calculation or Spontaneity?" sums up the challenge presented to us by current data and current population figures.

Marx's Challenge to Malthus

With these two exceptions there is a wide measure of agreement on the first three propositions. Before coming to the points of disagreement it will be well to restate firmly: there are no differences at all that the kernel of Marx's challenge to Malthus remains as valid as ever, namely, that the factors flowing from social organisation are cardinal, and that social reorganisation eliminating (i) the brakes on full utilisation of resources set by the profit motive, (ii) the waste in diversion of resources to war and war preparation, (iii) the exploitation of developing countries by neo-colonialism, is the most potent means of coping with population increase. There are no differences about this. We all regard the fight for socialism, against war, against colonialism and neo-colonialism as the struggle basic to creating conditions for the full solution of population problems.

In this connection I think Tony Chater has made a most important point. Accepting that one must concern oneself with day-to-day questions—health, housing, education, etc., not only because they cannot be deferred until the time when the conditions for their full solution have been created by socialism, but also because the struggle for them is merged, by experience, in the struggle for socialism —he points out that the struggle for full utilisation of resources is internationally on the agenda already, in the framework of the UN conferences (the one already held and another scheduled) on Trade, Aid and Development. This battle should be ranged beside the others.

No-one can disagree that in the problem of the relation of resources and population, utilisation of the former is just as relevant as limitation of the latter. Nor can anyone deny that the technical know-how exists immediately to increase resources exploitation, once social obstructions are removed, whereas effective limitation of population is at best a difficult, slow business, in which the stickiest opposition is formed by custom and tradition from which people, like kittle-kattle, are hard to budge.

Resources and Population

The attractive deduction from all this, however, that we may most profitably fight against imperialist rule, neo-colonialist exploitation and to increase technological use of resources, while leaving population limitation just to catch on or not by a few birth-control leaflets, is inappropriate. I feel (I hope I do them an injustice) that this is a mistake still made by Chater, and to some extent also by Carter and Feldmar. Idris Cox's figures show that direct exploitation by neo-colonialist relations is greater by far than the total of aid and that its cessation would provide adequate capital for development. But to suppose that its mere cessation, arithmetically effective, would be practically effective is illusory. This is well brought out in a study by Professor Guzevatyi, senior research officer of the Institute of World Economics and International Relations of the USSR Academy of Sciences.[1]

The trouble is that, as I adduced in my opening to the discussion, the population increase now taking place in developing countries makes the struggle against imperialism and neo-colonialism more, not less, difficult. After carefully examining the concrete conditions in a number of Asian and African countries, Guzevatyi shows how in these conditions there is an abundance of labour, how

[1] Professor Y. N. Guzevatyi: "Population Problems in Developing Countries", No. 9 (September) of *International Affairs* (Moscow, 1966).

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

population increase often actually rises with liberation and how this increase has delayed development, delayed benefit to the population from such increase in production as has taken place, prevented absolute increases in product from being translated into per capita increase, led to proportionate decrease in schooling and literacy in spite of absolute increases, etc.

Population and National Liberation

He then goes on (I quote at length in case his article is inaccessible to some readers):

> "The acute shortage of capital and food, increasing with the growth of the population, seriously hinders the strengthening of national independence in the liberated countries. Forced to turn to the imperialist states for credits, grain and other agricultural products to meet the immediate needs of the population, these countries thereby throw open the door to foreign capital. This leads in a greater or lesser degree to their losing freedom of action in foreign politics. Besides, imperialist 'aid' generally tends to consolidate the reactionary forces within the recipient country.
>
> "In the young national states which have chosen the non-capitalist path of development, the reactionary forces try to make use of economic difficulties, especially food shortages, to discredit the ideas of Socialism and to fan dissatisfaction among the people. These counter-revolutionary schemes have more chance to succeed in countries where leaders of the national-liberation revolution underestimate the complexity of the economic tasks, and population problems in particular. There have been some who sincerely hoped that the liquidation of the colonial regime would by itself ensure national economic upsurge and prosperity.
>
> "These over-optimistic expectations have been mercilessly chastised by reality. Indonesia, for instance, has achieved no substantial improvement of the economy and the living standard of the people for the whole twenty years the country has been independent. This could not fail to rouse disenchantment among the people and doubtlessly provided the background for the domestic policy crises which broke out in the autumn of 1965.
>
> "Such circumstances should apparently be taken into account in analysing home policy events in Ghana and a number of other liberated countries."

Guzevatyi's conclusion is:

> "*The overwhelming majority of newly liberated states are planning their economic development, but this cannot be achieved unless population factors are taken into account and efforts are made to influence them so as to ensure better combination of population growth and economic progress.*" (His italics.)

He makes absolutely clear: firstly that "you cannot expect family planning methods to be effective within the traditional stagnant social society, untouched by new ideas, bereft of prospects, insensible to real changes in life and consequently unconscious of the need to change habits in the field of family relations", hence a struggle for social and cultural change is part and parcel of the effective planning of families; second, that the Malthusian consideration of birth control as the *chief measure* (G's italics again) of overcoming difficulties is a diversion, and a population programme proceeding from it doomed to failure.

Principle and Circumstance

We return, therefore, to our capital point: that to the classical Marxist position must, on the population question, in these days and present circumstances be added a supplement. After all, there is nothing anti the methodology of Marxism, and everything pro, to connect principle with circumstance. When the Lord told Adam to go forth, multiply and replenish the earth he was addressing a world population of two. When Marx and Engels lambasted Malthus they could concentrate on the outstanding error of giving primacy to population increase factors instead of those deriving from social organisation, because there was still a good deal of margin. But even then, as can be seen from a study of their works, they allowed for the possibility of circumstances which would make population limitation requisite.[2] The proper supplement is: the circumstances of every case must be studied to find the proper priorities. And in many cases we will find that a fifth campaign—for population limitation—will be necessary alongside those for socialism, against war, against colonialism and for full use and fair distribution of productive resources (together of course with the day-to-day struggle to win concessions for better living) as part of the whole campaign for social advance. In this campaign we Communists must not be behindhand—dragged reluctantly out of the mid-nineteenth into the late twentieth century—in studying the reality so as to devise and demand applicable and acceptable methods, but in the van.

Ultimate Targets

Finally, but by no means least, I must revert to the question of ultimate targets. That is: should we behave as though the maximum will be the optimum? Here, I must confess, I find myself quite unable to follow either Chater or Bernal, whose attitude in this respect seems to me totally unscientific. Dobb is ready to humour it, I am not. Bernal's numerical argument that the more human beings there are the

[2] Readers may be interested to know that the Engels passage cited from Professor Kalganov on page 173 of my opening to discussion last June is taken from Engels' letter to Kautsky, Feb. 1st, 1889, pub. Vol. 35, Marx and Engels' Collected Works, pp. 123-125 (Moscow, 1964).

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more likely the appearance of genius, seems to me a mathematician's, or physicist's or chemist's argument, but to fly totally in the face of all biological and sociological experience. Every human being is the product of nature (genetic constitution) and nurture (environment) and allowance must be made for the possibility, even probability, of crowded conditions hindering certain kinds of individual development (I recall in this connection Einstein's plea for young mathematical theoreticians to be given jobs as assistant lighthouse keepers). I note also the concept of crowdedness and space in this connection must of course include not only the magnitude of the finite earth but the impact of neighbours on the finite human nervous sytems that can only accommodate a finite number of impulses in a given time. As for Chater's harping on space travel as a means of getting rid of population surplus to the maximum accommodation on earth, allow me to quote from an article by his fellow thinker Ernst Kolman in No. 1 of the new Soviet "Digest" in English *Sputnik* ("Is Space Exploration Worth While?", pp. 214-16):

> "The Earth's population, well over 3,000 million even today, will, at the present growth rate, be almost double that by the end of the twentieth century. And man's needs in food, housing, clothing, services, and cultural amenities will be all the greater as living standards are lifted and levelled out. No matter what quantitative index and what complications we encounter in assessing this upward trend in personal and social needs, their satisfaction will require far greater resources of power and raw materials.
>
> "From where will these resources come? Nearly 900 thousand million will inhabit our planet in 400 years, if the current population growth rate is sustained. Average density will jump from 6 to 22 people per square kilometre of land surface [Q.: a misprint for "from 6 to 2,200"? IM]—given that the most optimistic forecasts of scientific advance come true—unless he breaks away from the Earth. His entry into outer space will be inevitable."

And how! All aboard for Tony Chater's "Skylark".

This only goes to show that Digests can be equally indigestible in any country.

I cannot accept as other than an evasion these attitudes that we must not foresee overcrowding, and what we should ourselves dislike about it, because we cannot foresee the tastes of our descendants, which may be quite different. It is our duty, in so far as we are concerned with posterity, and I think communists are, to plan on the basis of the best possible foresight framed by the best available knowledge. As well argue that we need not work for communism because by the time we reach it our posterity may wish we hadn't. Of course their tastes will be different, but we act on the assumption, which is probable, that they won't be as different as that.

It seems to me that this question of the targets ahead *is* important now. Gusevatyi correctly observes that the conditions in developing countries, which he analyses, arise from "completely concrete historically transient conditions". Of course they do, but what we must get away from is the wholly arbitrary guess (for which there is no warrant anywhere in Marx and Engels) that the "maximum is optimum" is normal and the situation analysed by Guzevatyi a mere local interruption.

Maximum is not Optimum

This is based on a wrong understanding of history. Bernal does not like my inferences from the behaviour of grasshoppers, rats, apes. Let us take man himself. I direct attention to the important paper of Mrs. Mary Douglas, Reader in Social Anthropology in the University of London (University College) "Population Control in Primitive Groups".[3] There is evidence for the suggestion that control of population, to the optimum for his purpose at the given stage, is and has been characteristic of man whenever necessary; rather is it *maximum breeding* that is likely to be the exception, linked, as a Marxist would expect, to the transient conditions imposed for their own benefit by various ruling classes, and justified by the religions developed to their support.

The normal—control of population size for maximum happiness under the given conditions[4] is precisely what Marxists should fight these hangovers in order to restore, for everybody, just like the classless society itself. Once again, this control is exercised by human beings not even primarily for food, but for the kind of life they want to lead. The Ndembu: cassava is their staple and would support a much denser population, but they are not all that interested in cassava, which is their bread and butter, they are interested in hunting. And they may well be overpopulated from the hunting point of view. The Tikopian staples are roots and cereals, but they limit their population by the availability of coconuts, which interest them more. Mrs. Douglas calls this the "oysters and champagne" factor in population control. And it really is of the highest relevance. *The Times* New York correspondent (September 14, 1966) reports Dr. Arthur Karler, research co-ordinator for the Chicago meat-packing firm of Wilson and Co., complaining that mycelium

[3] *British Journal of Sociology*, Vol. XVII, No. 3 (Sept., 1966). I alluded to some of its contents last June but could not quote as it was read at a private meeting and was not yet published.

[4] Of course, in the past this has operated as maximum happiness of the ruling group.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

grown on hog's hair ("25 per cent to 65 per cent protein"), yeasts grown on petroleum wax, powdered protein extracted from vegetable residue or even patties of powdered fish "were not acceptable to poor populations which needed them", mainly because they do not "feel" like meat.

If maximum populations are the destiny of the future world, make no mistake about it, we shall have to put up with mycelium and its equivalent, not only in foodstuffs but in many other aspects, of living as well, not just the poor but everybody. I refuse to accept this Brave New World where a new Marie Antoinette, B.Sc., tells us that if there is not enough bread we can eat mycelium cake. Didn't Marx say, come communism, we would each have enough—not just to tick over, but within reason what we want? Too many *then* certainly won't be able to, and too many *on the way* will be slower getting there or may not get there at all. So why should we have no limit? If Dobb's conjecture is right, that economies of scale are not significant economically in communities beyond a certain size, we should do much better to drop this "maximum equals optimum" dogma and adopt a really Marxist attitude, habituating people to the desirability (and often necessity) of population control to the optimum for each given set of circumstances, and leading the way in study of the factors involved in every different situation and the methods to apply. Then it will fall into perspective relation with all our other tasks.

Marxism and Criticism

Terry Eagleton

MICHAEL LONG'S recent appeal in *Marxism Today* (November 1966) for serious attention to literary critical ideas which Marxists have too easily ignored in the past seems to me admirable, and the brief criticisms I want to make here of some of his attitudes exist within this context of general agreement. What I want to criticise isn't this call to consider the poetic ideas of Pound, Carlos Williams and Fenollosa, and certainly not the appeal for Marxists to break free from restrictive and censorious attitudes to art and artists, but some implications of the ideas of Fenollosa and Pound which seem to me dangerous, within the framework of socialist belief.

Ernest Fenollosa's appeal is for a poetic language which enacts gesturally the intricate energies, changes and substance of natural processes, rendering them with a truthful precision which resists subjective distortions and mystifying idealisms. By cleansing and sharpening our perception of what actually is there in the world, we gain what Michael Long calls a "nutrition of impulse", a fresh, clean sense of actuality which modifies and feeds our own humanity.

Man and Nature

This critical approach has provided the basis for a good deal of modern poetry: certainly for Pound and Carlos Williams, but also for Thom Gunn, Charles Tomlinson, Jon Silkin, and a whole range of young English poets. The need to free the world through poetry of mystifying human projections, to capture and render it in the intricate fullness of its contained integrity, has given contemporary poetry a new kind of direction, a fresh, felt authenticity which can be clearly seen as a reaction to an earlier poetry which could feel the material world only through its private symbolism, its specific subjective moods.

Even so, there are some profoundly questionable assumptions behind this return to authenticity. The need for a direct and specific confrontation with material reality can merge easily into the belief that man's relation with Nature is unmediated: that the individual mind, freed of confusing concepts, abstractions, conventions, can focus on natural processes in their naked actuality. Michael Long wants to see the removal from our environment of "the obfuscation, the mystification wrought upon it by the intrusion between us and it of idealistic notions of our relation with it", the clearing away of "man-uttered dogmas which get between us and the world". I believe that this urge to a direct, unmediated confrontation with reality is in fact a naturalistic fallacy, and one radically non-Marxist in its emphasis.

One of the most crucial extensions of a Marxist way of conceiving the relation of consciousness and reality, in our own time, has been a body of modern cultural thinking which includes the work of European phenomenologists (Heidegger, Sartre, Merleau-Ponty), English social critics like Raymond Williams and the linguistic philosophy of Ludwig Wittgenstein. What this tradition is concerned to stress is there is in fact no "natural", "neutral" seeing of things-in-themselves, shorn of a conceptual per-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spective; on the contrary, our capacity as individuals to grasp and render intelligible material reality is itself a *social* capacity, mediated to us by that whole structure of language, concept, modes of perception and relationship which composes our culture.

Our individual perception is social and cultural; our seeing takes place from within a bodily, linguistic and cultural perspective on the world which makes that world uniquely meaningful for us, grasped by no two languages or cultures in precisely the same way. The material world is thus not an alien presence to be neutrally inspected so that its laws and processes may be discerned: what we *see* to be there in that world in the first place depends on how, culturally, we interpret and formulate the world, how it is present to our culture in the substance of that culture's language, and thus mediated to an individual. A culture is the material world as it is held and shared uniquely by the consciousness of a society; to believe that one can "see" outside this structured consciousness, that one can "get behind" language and concept to dig out the truth, is itself a form of alienation—the Zola-esque fallacy of the world as self-contained, and man's greatest creative effort as the correct rendering by a passive mind of processes essentially external to him.

Perception Socially Mediated

What both Marxism and phenomenology are concerned with, in the first place, is not the isolated contact of an individual mind with the world, but the relation of *men* with *their* world; the individual stance towards nature is then mediated through this general structure. Perception is socially mediated in precisely the way that work, as a relation to nature, is mediated by a social structure of relationships; what is in issue in both cases is *culture* —the way a particular society grasps the material world—not a personal, direct and unmediated relation.

Michael Long's article seems to me to miss this crucial fact. The emphasis of Pound on the specific and particular, as against the general abstraction, is quoted approvingly, although this emphasis, as with Leavis, is ultimately a form of liberal individualism; the abstractions which are rejected are precisely those social concepts and conventions which relate personal to social experience. It is natural that, when the social concepts and conventions are felt to have gone stale, there will be a renewed insistence on unique individual freshness of perception, cleared of received cultural forms; but this response, too, must be historically placed, as a dismissal of the social dimension of all individual experience and perception. (It is significant how close many of Pound's ideas are to that American tradition from Thoreau and Emerson to Whitman which saw any human society or institution as a false consciousness imposed on the "reality" and "ultimate truth" of Nature; the process, then, of digging behind social forms to arrive at "truth" is quite obviously based on an alienated version of human society, and of the Marxist relation of nature and culture.)

This alienation links with the Fenollosan alienation of seeing the human mind as a "microscope", which Michael Long again quotes approvingly. This belief in the passivity of the mind, correctly observing an external reality, is a naturalistic commonplace, in reaction to the symbolist exaggeration of subjective creativity, but its inadequacy needs to be exposed. Human consciousness is not passive but creative; not trained to correctly interpret an external reality, but to transform and appropriate that reality *in the act* of opening responsively to it, of recognising it as other. Poetry, like work, is a means of transforming reality in the act of recognition; a means, not simply of rendering the non-human world in its integrity, but of changing and modifying the human world in the same act. Michael Long seems not to see this dialectical interaction of poet and reality, located most evidently in metaphor: he stresses the intrinsic dynamism of the natural process but not the *transforming* dynamism of man's relation to it in language.

Describing and Transforming

To sum up: Carlos Williams's dictum "No ideas but in the thing" is simultaneously a vital recognition of the integrity of the natural world, and part of a tradition of naive empiricism which involves the

Please post *MARXISM TODAY* to me every month.

I enclose (put X in the appropriate box)

☐ 14s. 6d. for 6 months

☐ 29s. for one year.

(write in capital letters)

Name.....

Address.....

.....

Post with remittance to:

Central Books Ltd.,

37 Gray's Inn Road, London, W.C.1.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

alienation of the creative and transforming mind from the world in which it is engaged. Language is creative, not simply by accurately rendering processes which exist apart from it, but because it is itself the medium within which these processes become intelligible in the first place, become locatable in a particular historical and cultural structure of meaning. What is needed—and what I believe an authentic Marxism provides—is that dialectical point between the subjective distortions of symbolism and the bourgeois empiricism of naturalism which sees man's relation to his environment, whether in work or language or perception, as *simultaneously* an apprehension of the object in its otherness, and as a drawing it inside the human community. This simultaneous process seems to me divided by Michael Long: the poem is the rendition of the object in its integral otherness, which *then*, in a second step, becomes available for a general human context of significance and growth. The greatest poetry seems to me one which sees no such division between recording and feeling, seeing and evaluating, describing and transforming, and it is towards this which I believe we should work.

Published by the Communist Party, 16 King Street, London, W.C.2, and printed by Farleigh Press Ltd. (T.U. all depts.), Watford, Herts.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Collet's offers the following Maps and Guides to those travelling in Eastern Europe or the Soviet Union this year.

Bulgaria
THE BULGARIAN GUIDEBOOK
340 illustrated pages. Street maps of major cities, folding map of country.
Ref. 0354 12s 6d

Czechoslovakia
CZECHOSLOVAKIA BY CAR 1:1,000,000
223 pp. with photographs, itineraries, sketch-maps and folding map of routes.
Ref. 0365 24s 0d

Germany (G.D.R.)
TOURIST MAP FOR MOTORISTS IN THE G.D.R.
228 pp. 100 coloured maps. In German with key in Russian and English.
Ref. 0367 30s 0d

Hungary
HUNGARY—THE OFFICIAL GUIDEBOOK
391 pp. Coloured illustrations.
Ref. 0373 21s 0d

Poland
ROAD ATLAS OF POLAND 1:500,000
155 pp. sectional maps. Plastic.
Ref. 0385 32s 6d

Rumania
RUMANIA—MAP FOR MOTORISTS 1:850,000
Two folding maps. 32 pp. notes.
Ref. 2026 8s 6d

U.S.S.R.
AUTO ATLAS OF THE U.S.S.R.
Although printed in Russian, the 131 pages of coloured maps are easily understandable. Includes 61 detail maps of approach roads to main towns. Boards. Ref. 2996 15s

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
—ADMINISTRATIVE MAP 1:8,000,000
Folded into stiff cover. Place names and legend in English. Ref. 2624 6s 6d

Yugoslavia
BY CAR THROUGH JUGOSLAVIA
Road map with distances, camping sites, etc. Sketch maps. Boards. 136 pp.
Ref. 0380 12s 6d

Send for list of many more guides and maps or call at our shop for unlisted items.

Collet's Multilingual Bookshop,
64 Charing Cross Road, London, W.C.2

due out in March

THE SCIENTIFIC REVOLUTION

John Moss

First of a new series of short books, the *Science Today* series, which will deal with the ways scientific discoveries can now improve and revolutionise the conditions of everyday life. John Moss's themes range from the effects of automation to the elimination of smog, and he shows what requires to be done *now* to realise the promise of the Scientific Revolution.

paper **6s**

to be published shortly

ÆSCHYLUS AND ATHENS

George Thomson

New edition of the famous Marxist study of classical Greek tragedy. It contains a profound inquiry into the origins, development and latent conflicts of Athenian democracy, in which we find the roots of Western civilisation and culture.

paper **21s** *cloth* **42s**

published last month

BREAKING THE FETTERS

Bob Stewart

Reminiscences of the "grand old man" of the Communist Party. "Bob shows up in this book as we know and love him—very wise, very humorous, an indomitable and implacable fighter . . . and very shrewd." (*Marxism Today*)

21s

LAWRENCE & WISHART

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HISTORY OF THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION

Editor: P. N. SOBOLEV

The fiftieth anniversary of the October Revolution will be celebrated next November. To mark the occasion, the Institute of History of the USSR Academy of Sciences has prepared a new comprehensive history of the October Revolution. *Illustrated.*

441 pp **18s**

MAN'S DREAMS ARE COMING TRUE

In this book, also issued in connection with the fiftieth anniversary of the first socialist state, a group of Soviet scientists trace the development of men's ideas about an "ideal" society from early myths to Marxist scientific socialism, and outline the main features of the society now being created in the USSR.

358 pp **12s 6d**

CENTRAL BOOKS
37 Grays Inn Road London WC1

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW 1967—No. 2

S. A. DANGE
India on the eve of Elections

M. HARMEL
True Nature of Imperialist "Aid"

FINLAY HART
Work of a Communist Councillor in Scotland

Price 2s. 6d. (plus 6d. postage)
15s. for 6 months
30s. for 1 year

from

CENTRAL BOOKS LTD.
37 Gray's Inn Road, London, W.C.1

COMMUNIST PARTY
HOLIDAY SCHOOL
LOSEHILL HALL, CASTLETON
(In the heart of the Peak District)

August 5th-12th, 1967

on

"Capitalism and Socialism in the Sixties"

Lectures on "100 Years of 'Capital' and its relevance today"; "50 years of Socialism in the U.S.S.R., the Socialist World today"; "Prospects of the African Revolution"; "Some Problems of Marxism today"; "Socialism, Freedom and the Individual"; "Problems of Culture today"; etc. etc.

Cost: £11 per head

Apply to:
Education Department,
Communist Party,
16 King Street, London, W.C.2.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED